IZHAR-UL-HAQ

Part 2

Contradictions and Errors in the Biblical Text

Maulana M. Rahmatullah Kairanvi

IZHAR-UL-HAQ

Part 2

Contradictions and Errors in the Biblical Text

Maulana M. Rahmatullah Kairanvi

TaHa Publishers Ltd.
1, Wynne Road
London SW9 OBB
England

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

The English translation of this truly remarkable work of scholarship will hopefully bring it to the audience it deserves and to which it is most relevant. Its importance lies not so much in the author's actual discoveries as in their implications for the impartial Christian reader. The contradictions and errors in the biblical text, most of them acknowledged by Christian scholars, prove beyond a doubt that the biblical account of events is, to say the least, unreliable and occasionally clearly manipulated to serve the interests of particular individuals or power groups. This means in turn that the biblical version of events can only be accepted in the most general terms and that serious doubt must be thrown on the accounts of even such central events of Christianity as the 'crucifixion' and 'resurrection'of Jesus. This in turn opens the way for Christians to accept the true and definitely divinely revealed version of these events in the Qur'an.

INTRODUCTION

by

Syed Hassan Mohammad Kutbi
Former Minister of Hajj
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

The Truth Revealed is a book which describes Islam as the inspired truth, guiding mankind to faith, peace and security. Islam is the religion of Abraham from whom all the followers of thethreeheavenly religions claim to belong.

The conflict between Islam and the Christian missionaries in the Indian sub-continent turned into a fierce fight in which Islam was defended by a faithful man who depended on Allah alone. He was equally true and faithful in his understanding of the other heavenly religions in their true form, as revealed to the Prophets Moses and Jesus Christ, which in essence accord with the teachings and spirit of Islam.

The conflict was of greater importance than the wars with early Arab infidels (the Quraysh and other tribes) and the Crusades, and so was the victory. One side in it was supported by the strength, resources and media of a strong Christian government. The stake was enormous as any set-back would be fatal to them in this most important and strategic area. All the powers of the Christian religion joined to defend their teachings from being blamed for alterations in their scriptures which, if proved, might mean Christians abandoning their religion.

The Christians go on pilgrimage not only to seek forgiveness, but also to gain spiritual blessings to fight against all the other religions, Islam being the foremost. In this particular conflict they had a clear plan to destroy Islam and the Muslims in

India before spreading their fight to the rest of the Islamic world, as, having already achieved victory in India, it would then be easier elsewhere.

Islam had already made its strength felt in India by Rajab 70 AH, and India and its people became a great Islamic power, as India had a great civilisation and great wealth. It also became a major aim for the ambitious colonial powers to conquer India and the sub-continent. Since the power in India was with Islam they, therefore, mischievously started spreading Christianity. The activities of the Christians started by appointing a bishop for the Christians and changing the Great Mosque of Delhi into a church. Books denouncing the Islamic faith were published to confuse the common Muslims. The old prejudice of Christianity against Muslims even led them to commit murders.

This conduct startled Muslim scholars into defending their faith, without any regard to the sacrifice involved. The Muslims decided to publish books and to increase the religious awareness of the common Muslims so as to counteract the unfair attack on Islam. This programme was effective in protecting the image of Islam. A number of books were written, numerous debates were conducted, and a lot of meaningful speeches were delivered in the mosques transmitting Islam as the true religion.

All this brought into the limelight a great man to lead the Muslims engaged in defending Islam. This learned scholar, Shaykh Rahmatullah Kairanvi not only defended Islam, but also exposed Christianity and its teachings by obtaining guidance **only** from the Qur'an. Being a true Muslim scholar, he had all the courage necessary to sacrifice his life for the sake of Allah, cherishing the saying:

> If I am killed for being a Muslim, I do not care on which side my body lies. It is for the sake of Allah.

The great and faithful Shaykh Rahmatullah challenged the head of the Christian Mission of India at that time, the Rev. C.C.P. Fonder to an open debate to prove to the Christians that Muslims had been silent merely because they did not feel that an answer had been necessary. However, since the anti-Islamic forces had been making false claims and increasing their efforts against Islam, the time had come for a Muslim scholar to expose the true facts in an open debate.

The Rev. Fonder said, "Let it be here in Agra where the Muslim scholars have been reading the Bible, and reading my books, and other books written by Western scholars in order to prove that the Bible was false as it contains alterations and that my books are also false."

The debate took place in January, 1854, in Akbarabad in the city of Agra. Shaykh Rahmatullah proved that the Bible used at that time and still in use now was not the one given to Jesus (peace be upon him). The Rev. Fonder admitted that there were alterations in the Bible in seven or eight places.

Shaykh Qamar al-Islam, the Imam of the Grand Mosque, asked a journalist Khadim Ali Khan to publish the missionary's admission that there were seven or eight alterations in the Bible, upon which the Rev. Fonder shouted, "Yes, I do admit to this, but this small alteration does not affect the Holy Book of the Heavens!"

Hearing this Shaykh Rahmatullah commented, "If any alteration is proved to have been perpetrated in a particular text, it is considered null and void and invalidated. Since you admit that the Bible has been altered in seven or eight places, how can you

claim that it is true and how can you believe in it?"

The first debate ended on this note.

On 11th April 1854, there was a second debate, attended by diplomats and important dignitaries from all walks of life. It also ended in humiliation for the Chief Missionary, who disappeared after a couple of sessions and did not attend the rest of the debate.

Before starting the debate, the Chief Missionary had asserted in front of all those present, "This debate is held at the request of Shaykh Rahmatullah. I have accepted it without any personal benefit to me. I am going to show you the clear proofs that prove the Christian religion to be a true one. You should be aware that the subjects of this debate are: revelation, alterations, the divinity of Jesus, the Trinity, and the mission of Muhammad."

Shaykh Rahmatullah asserted that he would convert to Christianity if he failed to answer the questions of the missionary who also made the commitment to accept Islam if he was defeated.

The result was the admission that the Bible had been altered. The victory, proving Islam to be the true religion caused the brutal aggression on the part of the British government against the Muslims in India in 1857, in which thousands of renowned Muslim scholars were killed. Shaykh Rahmatullah was at the top of the list, but Allah saved him. He escaped to Makka al-Mukarrama, and there he established the Madrasa Saulatia.

Sultan Abdul-Aziz Khan invited Shaykh Rahmatullah to Constantinople, where he held a great celebration for him, and requested him to write a book on the debate. He wrote the book, *The Great Debate*, which later became known as *The Truth Revealed* (*Izharu'l-Haqq*).

Then times changed and scholars in the West themselves

started rejecting their altered religion. Some scholars accepted the fact of the Holy Qur'an and became Muslims while others did not accept the truth of the Holy Qur'an and have yet to join the faithful.

A dire need was felt to translate the book of *The Great Debate* into English so that its message would be read and comprehended. Allah has now made this possible and the book has been translated into English. I pray to Allah to accept it as a sincere work and reward all those who were associated with it.

May Allah make it a cause for the right guidance of those who read it in the search for truth and a straight path.

Madina al-Munawwara
21 Jumada'th-Thani 1409 AH
28 January 1989 AD

CONTRADICTIONS AND ERRORS IN THE BIBLICAL TEXT

THE CONTRADICTIONS

"Had it (the Holy Qur'an) been from other than God, they would surely have found therein much discrepancy." (Qur'an 4:82)

The texts of all the Judaeo-Christian scriptures contain surprisingly numerous contradictions and errors that are easily spotted by a serious reader of the Bible. This section is devoted to pointing out some of these contradictions[1] in numerical order. The errors found in these texts will be discussed separately in the following section.

Contradiction No. 1

Any serious reader making a comparison between chapters 45 and 46 of the book of Ezekiel, and chapters 28 and 29 of the book of Numbers will notice great contradiction in the doctrines[2] mentioned therein.

Contradiction No. 2

A comparison between chapter 13 of the Book of Joshua and chapter 2 of Deuteronomy concerning the inheritance of the children of Gad discloses a plain contradiction. One of the two statements has to be wrong.

1. The author has given no less than one hundred and nineteen examples of such contradictions in the biblical text.
2. In both places there are injunctions regarding offerings and sacrifices. Readers may look these up themselves if interested.

Contradiction No. 3

I Chronicles chapters 7 and 8 concerning the descendants of Benjamin makes a statement which contradicts chapter 46 of Genesis. The Judaeo-Christian scholars have had to admit that the statement made by Chronicles is erroneous. This will be discussed later.

Contradiction No. 4

There is great discrepancy in the description of genealogical names in I Chronicles 8:29-35 and 9:35-44. This contradiction was noticed by Adam Clarke who says in volume 2 of his commentary:

> The Jewish scholars claim that Ezra had found two books which contained these sentences with the contradicting names and since he could not prefer one to the other, he included both of them.

Contradiction No. 5

In 2 Samuel 24:9, it says:

> And Joab gave up the number of the people unto the king: and there were in Israel eight hundred thousand valiant men that drew the sword and the men of Judah were five hundred thousand men.

On the other hand, we find in I Chronicles 21:5:

> And Joab gave the sum of the number of the people unto David. And all they of Israel were a thousand thousand and an hundred thousand men that drew sword: and Judah was four hundred and threescore and ten thousand men that drew sword.

The discrepancy in these statements amounts to a great contradiction in the number of people. There is a difference of three hundred thousand in the number of the Israelites while the difference in the number of the People of Judah is thirty thousand.

Contradiction No. 6

We read in 2 Samuel 24:13:

> So Gad[1] came to David, and told him, and said unto him, Shall seven years of famine come unto thee in thy land?

However we read in 1 Chr. 21:12:

> Either three years famine or....

The contradiction is quite obvious, since the former statement speaks of seven years of famine while the latter statement mentions only three years of famine referring to the same occasion. The commentators of the Bible have admitted that the former statement is erroneous.

Contradiction No. 7

In 2 Kings 8:26 we find this statement :

> Two and twenty years old was Ahaziah when he began to reign; and he reigned one year in Jerusalem.

In contrast with the above statement we read in 2 Chr. 22:2:

> Forty and two years old was Ahaziah when he began to reign...

1. According to Torah Gad was the prophet who was considered to be the seer of the unseen.

This contradiction speaks for itself. The latter statement is obviously wrong and the commentators on the Bible have admitted this to be the case. It has to be wrong because the age of Ahaziah's father, Jehoram, at the time of his death was 40 years and Ahaziah began reigning just after the death of his father as is known from the previous chapter. In this case if we did not negate the latter statement it would mean that the son was two years older than his father.

Contradiction No. 8

In 2 Kings 24:8 it is stated that:

> Jehoiachin was eighteen years old when he began to reign...

This statement is contradicted by 2 Chr. 36:9 which says :

> Jehoiachin was eight years old when he began to reign...

The contradiction is more than obvious. The second statement is erroneous as will be shown later in this book. This has been admitted by Bible commentators.

Contradiction No. 9

There is an obvious contradiction between the statements of 2 Samuel 23:8[1] and 1 Chronicle 11:11[2]

Both are talking of the mighty men of David. Adam Clarke, making comments on the former statements of 2 Samuel, has

1. "These be the names of the mighty men whom David had: The Tachomonite that sat in the seat, chief among the captains; the same was Adino the Eznite: he lift up his spear against eight hundred, whom he slew at one time."
2. "And this is the number of the mighty men whom David had; Jashobeam, an Hachmonite, the chief of the captains: he lifted up his spear against three hundred slain by him at one time."

quoted Dr Kennicot as saying that the verse in question contains three great distortions. This requires no further comment.

Contradiction No. 10

It is stated in 2 Samuel 5 and 6 that David brought the Ark to Jerusalem after defeating the Philistines, while chapters 13 and 14 of 1 Chronicles, describing the same event, make David bring the Ark before the defeat of Philistines.[1]
One of the two statements must be wrong.

Contradiction No. 11

In Genesis 6:19,20 and 7:8,9 we read:

> And of every living thing of all flesh, two of every sort shalt thou bring into the Ark, to keep them alive with thee; they shall be male and female.
> Of fowls after their kind and of cattle after their kind, of every creeping thing of the earth after its kind, two of every sort shall come unto thee.

But as we proceed a little further to the next chapter of this book we suddenly come to this statement.

> Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee by sevens, the male and his female, and of beasts that are not clean by two, the male and the female.

When we proceed to the next verse it says: "Of fowls also of the air by sevens..."

The contradiction speaks for itself.

1. Chapter 5 describes the events of war against Philistines while chapter 6 speaks of the Ark brought to Jerusalem by David whereas chapter 13 of 1 Chronicles speaks of the Ark and chapter 14 describes the defeat of Philistines.

Contradiction No. 12

It is understood from the Book of Numbers 31:7 that the Israelites killed all the men of Midian during the lifetime of Moses,[1] and only their young girls were allowed to live in servitude. This statement contradicts the description given in Judges 6 from which it is understood that in the time of Judges the Midianites were so strong and powerful that they dominated the Israelites while historically the time difference between the two periods is not more than one hundred years.

Having been totally wiped out, how could the Midianites have been sufficiently strong and powerful to keep the Israelites under their domination for seven years within the short period of only one hundred years?[2]

Contradiction No. 13

Exodus 9:6 states:

> And the Lord did that thing on the morrow, and all the cattle of Egypt died: but of the cattle of the children of Israel died not one.

This implies that all the cattle of Egypt had died but it is contradicted by another statement of the same chapter of the same book which says:

> He that feared the word of the Lord among the servants of Pharaoh made his servants and his cattle flee into the houses:
>
> And he that regarded not the word of the Lord left

1. "And they warred against the Midianites, as the Lord commanded Moses; and they slew all the males." 31:7.

2. "And the hand of Midian prevailed against Israel." Judges 6 : 2
"And Israel was greatly impoverished because of the Midianites." Judges 6:6

his servants and his cattle in the field.[1]

The discrepancy in the above statements needs no comment.

Contradiction No. 14

Genesis 8:4,5 contains this statement:

> And the Ark rested in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat.
>
> And the waters decreased continually until the tenth month: in the tenth month, on the first day of the month, were the tops of the mountains seen.

This statement contains a serious contradiction of facts, since the Ark could have not rested on the mountain in the seventh month as described in the first verse if the tops of the mountains could not be seen until the first day of the tenth month as described by the next verse.

Contradictions No. 15 - 26

A comparison between 2 Samuel 8 and 1 Chronicles 18, discloses a great number of discrepancies and contradictions in the original version in the Hebrew language, although the translators have tried to rectify some of them.

We reproduce some of them in parallel columns below, using the commentary of Adam Clarke on Samuel.

As can be seen there are numerous contradictions in these two chapters.

1. Exodus 9:20, 21.

VERSE NUMBER	THE WORDS OF 2 SAMUEL (8)	VERSE NUMBER	THE WORDS OF I CHRONICLES (18)
1	"David smote the Philistines and subdued them and took the tax[1] out of the hand of Philistines".	1	"David smote the Philistines and subdued them and took Gath and her towns out of the hand of Philistines."
3	"Hadadezer".	3	"Hadarezer".
4	"A thousand chariots and seven hundred horsemen.	4	"A thousand chariots and seven thousand horsemen."
8	"And from Betah and from Berothai, cities of Hadadezer king David took exceeding much brass."	8	"From Tibbath, and from Chun, cities of Hadarezer brought David very much brass."
10	"Joram, his son unto King David."	10	"Hadoram, his son to the king David."
17	"...and Ahimelech, the son of Abiathar were the priests, and Seraiah was the scribe."	17	"...and Abimelech, the son of Abiathar were the priests, and Shavsha was scribe."

Contradictions No. 27 - 32

Some other similar contradictions are found in the text of 2 Samuel 10 and 1 Chronicles 19. These contradictions are also mentioned by the commentators of the Bible. We reproduce below the contradicting words and phrases in two adjacent columns:

1. In nearly all the versions of the book the word tax has been given, but in the King James version the word is Metheg-ammah.

VERSE NUMBER	THE WORDS OF 2 SAMUEL (10)	VERSE NUMBER	THE WORDS OF I CHRONICLES (19)
16	"...Shobach, the captain of the host of Hadarezer..."	16	"...Shophach, the captain of the host of Hadarezer..."
17	"came to Helam."	17	"came upon them."
18	"..slew the men of seven hundred chariots of the Syrians, and forty thousand horsemen."	18	"slew of the Syrians seven thousand men which fought in chariots, and forty thousand footmen."

Contradiction No. 33

1 Kings 4:26 contains this statement :

> And Solomon had forty thousand stalls of horses for his chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen.

This statement is clearly contradicted by 2 Chronicles 9:25, which says:

> And Solomon had four thousand stalls for horses and chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen;

Urdu and Persian translations have the same number but the Arabic translator has changed four thousand to forty thousand. Adam Clarke, the commentator, having pointed out the controversies of various translations and commentaries, has said, that in view of the various discrepancies, it would be better to admit that the numbers (in the Book of Kings) have been changed and distorted.

Contradiction No. 34

Comparison of 1 Kings 7:24 and 2 Chronicles 4:2-3 also discloses a contradiction in the statement of facts.

In both texts a *natatorium* (molten sea) made by Solomon is mentioned. The text of the Book of Kings is this:

> And under the brim of it round about there were knops compassing it, ten in a cubit, compassing the sea round about: the knops were cast in two rows, when it was cast.

The text of Chronicles contains this description:

> Also he made a molten sea of ten cubits from brim to brim, round in compass...
>
> And under it was the similitude of oxen, which did compass it round about: ten in a cubit, compassing the sea round about. Two rows of oxen were cast, when it was cast.

This is what it says in the Urdu and English versions while the Arabic translation of 1865 describes neither knops nor oxen but totally different things, a kind of cucumber. Knop! Ox! or Cucumber! Can you find any relation between these totally different things?

Adam Clarke, making comments on the text of Chronicles, points out that the opinion of great scholars was to accept the text of the Book of Kings, and it was possible that the word *'bakrem'* might have been used in place of *'bakem'*. *'Bakrem'* signifies a knop and *'bakem'* an ox. To be short, the commentator has admitted the presence of human manipulation in the text of Chronicles. The compilers of Henry and Scott are forced to say that this difference in the text was due to a change in the alphabets.

Contradiction No. 35

2 Kings 16:2 says:

> Twenty years old was Ahaz when he began to reign, and reigned sixteen years in Jerusalem...

We find another statement in the same book in 18:2 regarding his son Hezekiah:

> Twenty and five years old was he when he began to reign; and he reigned twenty and nine years in Jerusalem.

This later statement means that Hezekiah must have been born when his father Ahaz was only eleven years old which is physically impossible.[1] Obviously one of the two texts is wrong. The commentators have admitted that the former statement is wrong. Commenting on chapter 16 the compilers of Henry and Scott say that apparently thirty has been written instead of twenty and have advised people to refer to 18:2 of the same book.

Contradiction No. 36

2 Chronicles 28:1 says:

> Ahaz was twenty years old when he began to reign, and he reigned sixteen years in Jerusalem:

Chapter 29 of the same book starts with these words:

> Hezekiah (the son of Ahaz) began to reign when he was five and twenty years old...

1. According to the first text Ahaz began to reign when he was twenty. He reigned sixteen years; his total age was thirty six years. According to the second text his son began to reign when he was twenty five years old. Deduction of 25 from 36 leaves eleven.

Here too (as in No. 35) one of the two texts has to be wrong and apparently it is the first text that is erroneous.

Contradiction No. 37

A comparison between 2 Samuel 12:31 and 1 Chronicles 20:3, presents another obvious contradiction between the two texts. Horne has also noted this difference and has suggested that the text of the 1 Chronicles should be changed to accord with the text of the Book of Samuel. He says, "The text of Samuel is correct, therefore the text of Chronicles may accordingly be altered."

What is to be noted from this example is the despotic and arbitrary attitude of the Christian theologians towards their holy scriptures. The more surprising fact in this regard is that this suggestion was followed by the Arabic translator in 1844 in the opposite direction to this suggestion. That is to say, he altered the text of the Samuel to accord with the text of Chronicles and not the other way round as was suggested by Horne.

The readers of this book should not be shocked by this. They will soon be coming to frequent distortions of this nature - a usual practice of the Christians.

Contradiction No. 38

We read in 1 Kings 15:33:

> In the third year of Asa king of Judah began Baasha the son of Abijah to reign all over Israel in Tirzah, twenty and four years.

Contrary to this 2 Chronicles 16:1 says:

> In the sixth and thirtieth year of the reign of Asa Baasha, King of Israel came up against Judah...

The contradiction between the texts is more than clear. One of the two texts must be wrong because according to the first text Baasha died[1] in the twenty-sixth year of Asa's reign so that in the thirty-sixth year of Asa's reign he has been dead for ten years. Obviously Baasha cannot invade Judah ten years after his death.

The compilers of Henry and Scott, commenting on the text of Chronicles have said, "Asher, a great Christian scholar, has said, "This twenty-sixth year is not the year of Asa's reign, but this is the year of the division of the kingdom which was in the period of Jeroboam."

The Christian scholars, however, have admitted that the text of Chronicles is erroneous - either the number thirty-six has been replaced by twenty-six or the phrase 'the division of the kingdom' is to be put in place of Asa.

Contradiction No. 39

The text of 2 Chronicles 15:19 is this:

> And there was no war unto the five and thirtieth year of Asa.

This text is again contradicting the text of 1 Kings 15:33 as has been shown in the previous argument under Contradiction No. 38.

Contradiction No. 40

The number of Solomon's officers looking after the work is described as three thousand and three hundred in 1 Kings 5:16 whereas in 2 Chronicles 2:2 this number is mentioned as three

1. Since he reigned twenty-four years, and ascended to the throne after two years of Asa's reign making twenty-six years, and 1 Kings 16 : 6 says, "Baasha slept with his fathers." And further in 16 : 8 of the same book we read, "In the twenty-sixtieth year of Asa, King of Judah began Elah, the son of Baasha to reign over Israel in Tirzah."

thousand and six hundred. The Greek translators have altered this number making it six hundred.

Contradiction No. 41

The text of 1 Kings 7:26 giving the description of the "molten sea" made by Solomon says, "It contained two thousand baths", while the text of 2 Chronicles 4:5 claims, "It received and held three thousand baths".

The Persian translation, 1838, speaks of the capacity of two thousand "idols". The Persian translation, 1845, contains, "Two thousand vessels," And the Persian translation, 1838, contains, "three thousand idols". The inconsistencies and discrepancies of these various texts speak for themselves.

Contradiction No. 42

When chapter 2 of the Book of Ezra is compared with chapter 7 of Nehemiah, several discrepancies and contradictions in the texts can be seen. Apart from textual differences, there are errors in number of the Israelites.

In the two chapters there are twenty numerical contradictions and many others where names are concerned. We reproduce below the errors concerning the numbers of the liberated Israelites:

VERSE NUMBER	THE TEXT OF EZRA, CH. 2	VERSE NUMBER	THE TEXT OF NEHEMIAH, CH. 7
6	The children Pahath-Moab... two thousand eight hundred and twelve.	11	The children of Pahath Moab...two thousand eight hundred and eighteen.
8	The children of Zattu, nine hundred forty and five.	13	The children of Zattu, eight hundred forty and five.
12	The children of Azgad, a thousand two hundred twenty and two.	17	The children of Azgad, two thousand three hundred twenty and two.
15	The children of Adin, four hundred fifty and four.	20	The children of Adin, six hundred fifty and five.
19	The children of Hashum, two hundred twenty and three.	22	The children of Hashum, three hundred twenty and eight.
28	The children of Beth-el and Ai, two hundred twenty and three.	32	The men of Beth-el and Ai, an hundred twenty and three.

Both texts agree on the total number of the Israelites who came to Jerusalem after the release from captivity in Babylon. These chapters claim that they were forty-two thousand three hundred and sixty. But if we add them ourselves, we do not obtain this number neither from Ezra or from Nehemiah. The total according to Ezra comes to twenty nine thousand eight hundred and eighteen, while in Nehemiah it adds up to thirty-one thousand and eighty-nine.

Nor is this total number correct according to the historians. Joseph (Eusephius) says in the first chapter of vol. 2 of his history:

> The Israelites that came from Babylon count to forty-two thousand, four hundred and sixty-two.

The compiler of Henry and Scott's commentary have said under the comments on the text of Ezra:

> A great difference has been caused between this chapter and chapter 7 of Nehemiah by the copyists. At the time of their rendering into English, the corrections were made through the available copies. Wherever the copies could not be found, the Greek translation was preferred over the Hebrew.

It may be noted how the texts of the Holy Scripture are so easily distorted in the name of correction, and how texts that remained acknowledged for centuries vanish altogether from the books. Meanwhile the books still remain full of errors and contradictions.

In fact, participation of human element in these books has been present from their very origin. The copyists are unjustifiably blamed for making errors. Even today a comparative reading of these two chapters will reveal more than twenty errors and contradictions.

Contradiction No. 43

We find this statement in 2 Chronicles concerning the name of the mother of King Abijah:

> His mother's name also was Michaiah, the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah. (13:2)

Contrary to this we find another statement in the same book to the effect that:

> He took Maachah the daughter of Absalom; which bare him Abijah... (11:20)

Again this latter statement is contradicted by the book of 2 Samuel 14:27 which says that Absalom had only one daughter named Tamar.[1]

Contradiction No. 44

It is understood from the Book of Joshua chapter 10 that the Israelites took over Jerusalem after killing the king, while 15:63 of the same book denies the capture of Jerusalem by the Israelites.[2]

Contradiction No. 45

2 Samuel 24:1 says :

> And again the anger of the LORD was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah.

This statement is plainly contradicted by I Chronicles 21:1 where it says that this thought was provoked by Satan. Since, according to the Christians, God is not the Creator of evil, this turns into a very serious contradiction.

CONTRADICTIONS IN THE GENEALOGY OF JESUS NO. 46-51

A comparative reading of the genealogy of Jesus according to the Gospel of Matthew and the genealogy according to Luke reveals a number of contradictions:

1. " And unto Absalom, there were born three sons, and one daughter, whose name was Tamar."
2. " As for the Jebusites the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah could not drive them out: but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day."

Contradiction No. 46

Matthew describes Joseph as son of Jacob, while Luke says Joseph son of Heli.[1]

Contradiction No. 47

According to Matthew, Jesus was a descendant of Solomon, the son of David,[2] while Luke puts him into the line of Nathan, the son of David.[3]

Contradiction No. 48

Matthew claims that the ancestors of Jesus right from David to the exile of the Israelites were all kings of great repute, while Luke says that except David and Nathan none of them was king. They were not even known as prominent personalities of their time.[4]

Contradiction No. 49

From Matthew we learn that Salathiel was the son of Jeconias[5] while Luke informs us that he was the son of Neri.[6]

Contradiction No. 50

We read in Matthew that "Zorobabel begat Abiud," while Luke says, "which was the son of Rhesa[7] which was the son of Zorobabel." It will be more surprising or rather very interesting

1. "Jacob begat Joseph" Matt. 1:16; "...the son of Joseph, who was son of Heli" Luke 3:23.
2. Matthew 1:6.
3. Luke 3:31.
4. Matthew, therefore, has mentioned the names of all the famous kings while in Luke there are totally different names of unknown personalities.
5. Matthew 1:12.
6. Luke 3:27.
7. Matthew 1:13; Luke 3:27.

for the reader to know that I Chronicles mentions all the names of the sons of Zorobabel, and neither Rhesa nor Abiud appear. It appears that both names are false.

Contradiction No. 51

According to Matthew there are twenty-six generations from David to Jesus, while according to Luke there are forty. As the period of time between David and Jesus is one thousand years, the gap from one generation to another according to Matthew is forty years and according to Luke twenty-five years. This contradiction is so clear that it requires no comment. It has been a cause of great embarrassment to the Christian theologians and scholars from the very inception of these two Gospels.

A group of great scholars like Eichhorn, Kaiser, Heins, De Wett, Winner Fritsche and others have plainly admitted that these two Gospels do really contain contradictions of an unjustifiable nature. Just as the two Gospels contain discrepancies in other places, so here too they are different from each other. Had they been free from discrepancies throughout, some justification for the difference in genealogical description might have been found.

Adam Clarke, however, making comments on chapter 3 of Luke, has reluctantly quoted some justifications together with his remarks of astonishment about them. He has, for instance, quoted Harmer on page 408 of vol. 5 making this unpalatable excuse:

> The genealogical tables were well kept by the Jews. It is known to everyone that Matthew and Luke have erred in such a way as to embarrass all the ancient and modern scholars. But as several objections were raised in the past against the author, for several doubtful points of the books, and, these objections, later on, turned out to be in his favour, similarly this objection too, will come to his aid. And time will certainly do it.

However, this contradiction is so serious that it has caused great embarrassment to both ancient and modern scholars. Their claim that the genealogical tables were kept safe by the Jews is false as it has been historically proved that they were destroyed in the course of the calamities and unfortunate accidents that have dogged the history of the Jews. For this obvious reason errors are found in the text of Ezra as well as these Gospels. Now if this was the condition of the scriptures in Ezra's time, one can imagine the condition of these texts in the time of the disciples. If the genealogies of the notable personalities and the priests could not be preserved, how much reliance can be put on the genealogy of poor Joseph who was only a carpenter. It is a possible assumption that the evangelists might have adopted two different genealogical tables concerning Joseph,[1] the carpenter, without proper regard to their accuracy. Harmer's hope that time would change this objection in favour of the authors seems very far from being realized since nineteen centuries have passed without the Evangelists being exonerated in this matter.

Had it been possible to do so, it would have been done a long time ago, seeing that in the last three centuries Europe has made such extraordinary advances in all branches of science and technology and has accumulated a treasure-house of resources to help in the search for the truth. As a result of scientific research in the field of religion, they first made some reforms in their faith and then rejected outright many of the established tenets and creeds of their religion.

Similarly the Pope, who was considered infallible and the highest authority of the Christians all over the world, was declared an impostor and unworthy of trust. Further, in the name of reforms, the Christians became subdivided into several sects and continued to make so-called reforms until they finally had to declare that Christianity as a whole was not more than a

1. Joseph, the carpenter, was the husband of Mary according to the Gospels.

collection of whimsical ideas and fabulous stories. Given this situation the future does not allow us to hope for any positive results.

The only explanation for this contradiction presented by some scholars is to say that perhaps Matthew has described the genealogy of Joseph whereas Luke might have written the genealogy of Mary. In this case Joseph would become the son-in-law of Heli who was himself without a son. Joseph, therefore, might have been described as the son of Heli. This explanation is unacceptable and is rejected for several reasons.
Firstly because in this case Jesus would not be a descendant of Solomon but a descendant of Nathan, as he would be included in the genealogy on his mother's side, not that of Joseph, the carpenter. If this were so, Jesus could not possibly have been the Messiah, since the Messiah who had been predicted by the prophets had to be a descendant of Solomon. This is why a great leader of the Protestant faith rejected this explanation saying to the effect that, "Whoever excludes the Christ from the genealogical line of Solomon, precludes the Christ from being the Christ."

Secondly this explanation is not acceptable until it is proved through authentic historical reports that Mary was indeed the daughter of Heli and Nathan's line was through her. Mere assumptions are of no avail in this regard especially in the presence of the adversary remarks of Calvin and Adam Clarke. On the contrary, it is expressly mentioned in the Gospel of John that the parents of Mary were Jehoachim and Joanna. And though this Gospel is not recognised by the modern Christians as a revealed book written by John, the disciple of Jesus, it is, undoubtedly a document of great historical value. Its author certainly belongs to the early times of Christianity. The book certainly has more historical value than the most reliable books of history. It cannot, therefore, be denied by unauthenticated reports.

St. Augustine said that he found a statement in a certain book that Mary was a Levite. This goes against her being a descen-

dant of Nathan. Besides, we find the following statement in the Book of Numbers:

> And every daughter, that possesseth an inheritance in any tribe of the children of Israel, shall be wife unto one of the family of the tribe of her father, that the children of Israel may enjoy every man the inheritance of his fathers.
>
> Neither shall the inheritance remove from one tribe to another tribe; but every one of the tribes of the children of Israel shall keep himself to his own inheritance. (Numbers 36:8,9)

And in the Gospel of Luke we read:

> There was a certain priest named Zacharias, of the course of Abia: and his wife was of the daughters of Aaron.

It is known from the Gospels that Mary was closely related to the wife of Zacharias (Elisabeth) which implies that Mary was also a descendant of Aaron. We have just read the commandment of Torah (Pentateuch) that any daughter of the children of Israel should be married to her own tribe, therefore Joseph also should be a descendant of Aaron. Jesus, in this case, would be a descendant of David.

To avoid this confusion two different genealogies were written. Since these Gospels were not known until the end of the second century, the writer of one genealogy remained unknown to the other genealogist. This is the apparent reason for the present contradiction in the two Gospels.

Thirdly, had Mary been the daughter of Heli, it must have been in the knowledge of ancient writers, who would not knowingly have presented such unbelievable explanations which, later on, were rejected and laughed at by modern writers.

Fourthly, the Gospel of Matthew says:

> Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called the Christ.

While Luke says:

> The son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli.

Both the statements clearly show that the authors are writing the genealogy of Joseph.

Fifthly, if we presume that Mary was the daughter of Heli, Luke's statement will not be true unless it is proved that it was customary among the Jews that they, in the absence of a real son, used to include the name of their son-in-law in their genealogy. This has not so far been proved by any authentic argument. As far as the unauthentic claims of the scholars of the protestant faith are concerned, they remain unacceptable to us on account of their lack of proof and valid arguments.

We do not deny the possibility of a certain person being associated with another person who is related to him through his father or wife or even being his teacher or his priest and he may be associated with the name of another person. That is to say we may, for example, refer to him as the king's nephew or the king's son-in-law in order to recognise him through a known personality. This kind of association is a totally different thing from someone being included in the genealogical line of another person. It is possible that it might have been a custom among the Jews to say that someone was the son of his father-in-law, but it remains to be historically proved that such a custom existed.

Another point to be noted here is that the Gospel of Matthew cannot have been known or acknowledged in the time of Luke. Otherwise it would have not been possible for Luke to contradict Matthew so blatantly that it has resulted in a serious embarrassment to the ancient and modern advocates of Christianity.

A comparative reading of Matthew 2 and Luke presents a great contradiction to the reader and tends to indicate that neither of the two Gospels are divinely inspired.

It is understood from the description in Matthew that the parents of the Messiah lived in Bethlehem even after his birth. It is also made clear by another description in Matthew that the period of their stay in Bethlehem was two years. Due to the domination of the Magians they afterwards migrated to Egypt and lived there during the lifetime of Herod,[1] and after his death, they returned to live in Nazareth. Luke, on the other hand, gives us a different description. He says that Jesus' parents went to Jerusalem after Mary's confinement,[2] and that after offering the sacrifice they went to Nazareth and lived there. However they used to go to Jerusalem every year at the feast of Passover.[3]

According to him there is no question of the Magians' coming to Bethlehem. Similarly, the parents of Jesus could have not gone to Egypt and stayed there as it is clear from what is said that Joseph never left Judah in his life neither for Egypt nor for any other place.

We learn from the Gospel of Matthew that Herod and the people of Judah were not aware of the birth of Jesus[4] until the Magians reported it to him.

On the other hand Luke says that after Mary's confinement when Jesus' parents had gone to Jerusalem to offer the sacrifice they met Simeon, who was a righteous man and to whom it had been revealed by the Holy Ghost that he would not die until he had seen the Messiah. He lifted Jesus high in his arms and told the people of his great qualities. Similarly Anna, a prophetess,

1. Herod, the Governor of Judah, who ruled the Israelites at the time of the birth of Jesus.
2. "And when the days of her purification, according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord." Luke 2:22.
3. "His parents went to Jerusalem, every year at the feast of passover." Luke 2:41.
4. "For Herod will seek the young child to destroy him." Matt. 2:13.

also told the people about the coming of the Messiah and thanked God. Now if we accept that Herod and his people were enemies of Jesus, Simeon would have not informed the people about Jesus in the temple where his enemies were all around, nor would the prophetess, Anna, have disclosed the identity of the Christ to the people of Jerusalem.

The scholar Norton, who is a great advocate of the Gospels, has admitted the presence of real contradiction in the two texts, and decided that the text of Matthew was erroneous and that of Luke was correct.

Contradiction No. 54

It is learnt from the Gospel of Mark that Christ asked the congregation to go away after his sermon of parables,[1] and the sea at that time was stormy. But from the Gospel of Matthew we learn that these events took place after the Sermon on the Mount.[2] This is why Matthew described the parables in chapter 13 of his Gospel. This sermon, therefore, is proved to have been a long time after these events, as the two sermons are separated by a long period. One of the two statements, therefore, has to be essentially wrong. The two authors, who claim to be men of inspiration or are considered by the people to be so, should not make erroneous statements.

Contradiction No. 55

The Gospel of Mark describes the debate of Jesus with the Jews as taking place three days after his arrival in Jerusalem. Matthew writes that it took place on the second day.

One of the two statement obviously has to be wrong. Horne says in his commentary (vol. 4 p. 275 1822 edition) regarding this contradiction and the one discussed before it that: "There is

1. The sermon of parables was delivered by Jesus by the bank of a lake.
2. The sermon on the mount was delivered by Jesus on a mountain. This is described by Matthew in chapters 5, 6, and 7.

no way of explaining these discrepancies."

Contradiction No. 56

The sequence of events after the Sermon on the Mount as given by Matthew is different from the one given by Luke. For instance, the events according to Matthew happened in this order; curing a leper,[1] Jesus' arrival at Capernaum, healing the servant of a Roman officer,[2] and healing of Peter's mother-in-law.[3] The Gospel of Luke first describes the event of Peter's mother-in-law,[4] then in chapter 5 describes the healing of the leper[5] and in chapter 7 the healing of the servant of a Roman officer.[6] One of the two statements certainly has to be erroneous.

Contradiction No. 57

According to the Gospel of John[7] some of the priests and Levites were sent by the Jews to John to inquire if he was Elias. He replied, "I am not Elias." This statement is expressly contradicted by Jesus according to Matthew 11:14 where Jesus is quoted as saying "And if ye will receive it, this is Elias which was for to come." And also we find this statement in Matthew 17:10-13:

> And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the scribes that Elias must first come?
>
> And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things.
>
> But I say unto you, That Elias is come already, and

1. Matt 8 : 3.
2. Ibid 8 : 13.
3. Ibid 8 : 16.
4. Luke 4:38. It should be noted that Peter is called Simon in this text. Simon and Peter are the name of one and the same person.
5. Ibid 5 : 13.
6. Ibid 7 : 10
7. John 1 : 19 - 21.

they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Likewise shall also the Son of man suffer of them.

Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John, the Baptist.

Both these texts denote that John the Baptist is the promised Elias, with the result that the statements of John and Jesus contradict each other.

A careful reading of the books of Christianity makes it almost impossible to believe that Jesus was the promised Messiah. To premise our argument, the following four points should first be noted:

Firstly, according to the book of Jeremiah when Jehoiakim, son of Josiah, burnt the scripture which was written by Baruch from Jeremiah's recitation, Jeremiah received the following revelation from God:

> Thus saith the Lord of Jehoiakim King of Judah; He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David.[1]

According to the word of Gabriel as quoted by Luke it is necessary for the Messiah to sit on the throne of David:

> And the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father, David.[2]

Secondly, the coming of the Christ was conditional on the coming of Elias prior to him. One of the major arguments of the Jews to support their disbelief in Christ was that Elias had not come, whereas his coming prior to the Messiah was positively necessary according to their books. Jesus himself confirmed that Elias must come first, but at the same time he said that Elias had already come but the people did not recognize him. On the other

1. Jeremiah 36 : 30.
2. Luke 1 : 32.

hand Elias himself denied being Elias.

Thirdly, the Christians do not consider the miracles of the prophets as an argument for faith in God or in the prophets. Matthew quotes the words of Jesus in 24:24 that:

> For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; in so much that, if it were possible they shall deceive the very elect.

Paul in his second letter to the Thessalonians 2:9 says regarding the Antichrist:

> Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders.

Fourthly, according to the law of the Pentateuch, anyone inviting people to the worship of something other than God should be killed in spite of any kind of wonders and miracles they might perform. And someone who claims divinity for himself is even more evil since not only does he claim godhood but also invites people to worship other than God.

According to the genealogy described by Matthew, Jesus was a descendant of Jehoiakim and is, therefore, according to the first proposition quoted above, not able to sit on the throne of David. Besides, Elias did not come before Jesus as is proved by the words of John himself that he was not Elias. Given this admission, anything contrary to it cannot be acceptable. And it is logically impossible to believe that John, being a prophet and a man of revelation, would not have been aware of his being Elias. Therefore, the second proposition, too, disallows Jesus from being the Messiah. And whereas, according to the belief of the Christians, Jesus claimed divinity for himself, this admission would make him liable to be killed according to the law of Moses, as we discussed in our fourth proposition.

As far as the miracles and wonders performed by Jesus are concerned they cannot, according to the belief of the Christians,

be an argument for his being a believer let alone a prophet.

All praise be to Allah who has saved us from these doubts and difficulties by means of His chosen prophet Muhammad, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, who informed us of the truth and taught us to believe that Jesus, the son of Mary, peace be on them both, was a true prophet and the promised Messiah and was absolutely free from the blame of making any claim to divinity. The Christians are responsible for attributing this claim to him.

Contradictions No. 58-63

Matthew chapter 11, Mark chapter 1, and Luke chapter 7, contain this statement:

> Behold! I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.[1]

According to the Christian commentators, the three Evangelists have quoted this line from the book of Malachi:[2]

> Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me.

The text quoted by the Evangelists is different in two ways from the text of Malachi. Firstly the words, "before thy face" do not exist in the text of Malachi, and have been added by all the three authors. Secondly, the text of Malachi uses the first person in the second sentence while the text of the three Gospels uses the second person. Horne quotes Dr. Rudolf in vol. 2 of his book saying:

> It is not possible to explain this difference easily,

1. This text has been quoted from Mark 1:2.
2. However Mark says that this statement is taken from Isaiah 1:2.

except that the earlier versions have been changed.

Contradictions No. 64-67

The following texts contradict each other :

(1) Matthew 2:6 and Micah 5:2.
The Matthew text says:

> And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not the least among the Princes of Judah: for out of thee shall come a governor, that shall rule my people Israel.

In the text of Micah, Bethlehem is mentioned as little.

(2) Acts 2:25-28 and four verses of Psalm 15, according to the Arabic version and Psalm 16:8-11 according to other translations.

(3) The Epistle to the Hebrews 10:5-7 contradicts Psalm No. 39 (Arabic) and Psalm No. 40:6-8 according to other translations.
The text of Hebrews has:

> Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo: I come to do thy will, O God!

Whereas in the Psalms it says:

> Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears thou has opened: burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required.
> Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me,

I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart.

(4) Acts 15:16,17 are inconsistent with Amos 9:11,12.
In Acts 15 it says:

After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof; and I will set it up, that the residue of men might seek after the Lord.

Amos has:

In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins and I will build it as in the days of old. That they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen, which are called by my name.

The Christian commentators have admitted the presence of contradictions in these texts and have acknowledged that the Hebrew version has been manipulated.

Contradiction No. 68

Paul's first letter to Corinthians 2:9 says:

But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.

The researches of the Christian theologians have concluded that this statement derives from Isaiah 64:4 which is this:

For, since of the beginning of the world, men have not heard, nor perceived by the ear, neither has the eye seen, O God, besides thee, what he hath prepared for

him that waiteth for him.

The difference between the two texts is quite obvious. The commentators of the Bible admit the presence of incompatibility in the above texts and say that the text of Isaiah has been distorted.

Contradiction No. 69

The Gospel of Matthew describes in chapter 9 that Jesus, after departing from Jericho, saw two blind men on the way and healed them of their blindness.[1] Contradicting this, Mark writes in chapter 10 of his gospel:

> ..blind Bartimæus, the son of Timaeus, sat by the highway side begging.

So in Mark the healing of only one man by Jesus is mentioned.

Contradiction No. 70

Matthew describes this event in chapter 8:28:

> ...into the country of Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs.

Then Jesus is described as healing them. This statement is inconsistent with the texts of Mark chapter 5 and Luke chapter 8, which is this:

> There met him out of the city a certain man which had devils...[2]

1. Matt. 9:27-31.
2. Luke 8:27.

Then he was healed by Jesus. Two men in the first quotation become one in the second.

Contradiction No. 71

It appears from chapter 21 of Matthew that Jesus sent two of his disciples to bring an ass and a colt from a village and the disciples:

> ...brought the ass and the colt, and put on them their clothes, and they set him thereon.[1]

While the rest of the Evangelists said that Jesus asked his disciples to bring only the colt or an ass and that when it came he rode on it.

Contradiction No. 72

Mark says in his first chapter: "And John ...did eat locusts and wild honey."[2]

While Matthew states that: "John came neither eating nor drinking."[3]

Contradiction Nos. 73-75

A comparison between the texts of Mark chapter one, Matthew chapter four and John chapter one, reveals inconsistencies regarding the circumstances in which the disciples embraced the new faith. The Gospels of Matthew and Mark write :

> And Jesus walking by the sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon called Peter, and Andrew, his brother,

1. Matt. 21:7.
2. Mark 1:6.
3. Matt. 11:18,19.

> casting a net into the sea... and he saith unto them, Follow me ... And they followed him ... He saw other two brethren James, the son of Zebedee and John his Brother, mending their nets ... he called them ... and they followed him.[1]

But the text of John is different from the above text in three ways. Firstly John does not mention the name of James. Secondly it describes that Jesus saw them with the exception of John on the banks of the Jordan (not Galilee). Thirdly John does not speak of their nets. The contents of John's text inform us that Jesus met John and Andrew on the banks of the Jordan then Peter was sent by Andrew. And on the next day came Philip and Nathanael. James is not mentioned.[2]

Contradiction No. 76

A comparison of chapter 9 of Matthew with chapter 5 of Mark reveals contradictions in the reports of the two evangelists concerning the ruler's daughter. Matthew reports:

> There came a certain ruler .... saying my daughter is even now dead.

While Mark says :

> He fell at his feet... saying, my little daughter lieth at the point of death.[3]

Further he says that Jesus went with the ruler, but on the way people came from the synagogue and said, "Thy daughter is dead."

Some early scholars have admitted that incompatibility exist-

1. Matt : 4:18 - 22.
2. John 1:42-51.
3. Mark 5:22, 23.

ed between the two texts. Some of them favoured the text of Matthew while some others preferred the text of Mark. Luke's text is similar to the text of Mark except that he writes that the report of the daughter's death was given only by one man.[1]

The death of the ruler's daughter has consistently been a point of confusion among scholars of the Bible. There is disagreement on the question of whether the daughter had died or was just looking as if she was dead. The learned scholar Nander is not convinced that she was dead. He said that, in fact, she was not dead but only looked as if she was. The scholars Balish, Sliemasher and Sassoon are also of the opinion that she was not dead but only unconscious. This is also supported by the statement of Jesus:[2]

> Weep not, she is not dead, but sleepeth.

According to these opinions this event does not serve the purpose of proving the miracle of the resurrection of the dead.

Contradiction No. 77

It is understood from Matthew and Luke that when Christ sent his disciples to preach, he forbade them to keep staves with them,[3] while on the contrary the text of Mark says that Jesus allowed them to keep their staves.[4]

Contradiction No. 78

It is said in chapter 3 of Matthew that :

> Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John,

1. Luke 8:49.
2. Luke 8:52.
3. "Nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves " Matt. 10:10.
4. They should take nothing for their journey, save a staff only." Mark 6:8.

to be baptized of him. But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?[1]

Further in the chapter it says:

> And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water ... and he saw the Spirit of God, descending like a dove...

And the Gospel of John describes this event in these words:

> And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shall see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.[2]

The Gospel of Matthew contains this statement in chapter 11:

> Now when John had heard in the prison the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples and said unto him. Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another.[3]

The first statement gives us to understand that John knew Jesus before the descending of the Spirit on him. Contrary to this the second statement quotes the words of John, "I knew him not", implying that John did not know Jesus before the descent of the Spirit on him. While the third takes a middle position.

1. Matt. 3:13.
2. John 1:32,33.
3. Matt. 11:2.

Contradiction No. 79

The Gospel of John has reported Christ as saying:

> If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true. (5:31)

And the same Gospel has reported Christ as contradicting this:

> Though I bear record of myself, yet my record is true. (8:14)

Contradiction No. 80

It appears from Matthew chapter 15 that the woman who came to Jesus crying for her daughter[1] was from Canaan. This information is contradicted by the Gospel of Mark chapter 7 where he reports that she was a Greek and a Syrophoenician by tribe.[2]

Contradiction No. 81

We read in the Gospel of Mark[3]:

> And they bring unto him one that was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech.

It is clearly understood from this that the man who was deaf and dumb, was a single person, but the description in the Gospel of Matthew plainly contradicts this, saying:

> And great multitudes came unto him, having with them those that were lame, blind, dumb, maimed and

1. "And behold a woman came out of the same coasts." Matt. 15:22
2. Mark 7:26.
3. Mark 7:32.

many others, and cast them down at Jesus' feet, and he healed them.[1]

This exaggeration is similar to the one made by John, the author of the fourth Gospel who says at the end of the book:

> And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written.[2]

What one should think of such statements? They are supposed to be men of inspiration beyond any criticism.

Contradiction No. 82

We read in the Gospel of Matthew that Jesus, addressing his disciples, said:

> ...I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto him, Lord, is it I? And he answered and said, He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me, ... then Judas answered and said, Master, is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said. [3]

The same event is described by John in a way that is greatly different from the above:

> Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me, Then the disciples looked one on another, doubting of whom he spake. Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved.

1. Matt.15:30.
2. John, 21:25.
3. Matt. 26 : 21-25.

Simon Peter, therefore beckoned to him, that he should ask who it should be of whom he spake. He then lying on Jesus's breast saith unto him, Lord, who is it? Jesus answered, He it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it. And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon.[1]

Contradiction No. 83

The Gospel of Matthew, describing the event of the arrest of Jesus says in chapter 26:48-50:

> Now he that betrayed him gave them a sign, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he: hold him fast. And forthwith he came to Jesus and said, Hail, Master; and kissed him... Then came they, and laid hands on Jesus, and took him.

The Gospel of John gives the same story with great differences in chapter 18:

> Judas then, having received a band of men and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees, cometh thither with lanterns and torches and weapons. Jesus therefore, knowing all things that should come upon him, went forth, and said unto them, Whom seek ye? They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them, I am he. And Judas also, which betrayed him, stood with them. As soon then as he had said unto them, I am He, they went backward and fell to the ground. Then asked he them again, Whom seek ye? And they said, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus answered, I have told you that I am he: if therefore ye seek me, let these go their way. ... Then the band and the captain and officers of the Jews took Jesus, and bound him.[2]

1. John : 13:21-26.
2. John 18:3-12 .

Contradiction No. 84

All the four Gospels give a description of Peter denying Jesus[1] after his arrest. But each description is different from the other in eight respects.

1. According to the reports of Matthew[2] and Mark[3] there were two maids who claimed that Peter was one of the disciples of Jesus, and some other men who "stood by". While Luke's description claims that there was one maid and two other men.

2. According to Matthew, when the first maid spoke to Peter he was sitting on the outside of the palace, while according to Luke, he was "in the midst of the hall,"[4] and according to Mark, he was "beneath in the palace", and according to John he denied him when he was inside the palace.

3. The wording of the maid's question to Peter is different in all the four Gospels.

4. According to the reports of Matthew, Luke and John, the cock crew only once after Peter had denied Jesus three times, while according to Luke, the cock crew three times; once just after the first denial of Peter, and twice, after the second denial.

5. According to Matthew and Luke, Jesus had foretold Peter that he would deny Jesus thrice before the cock crew

1. According to the Gospels, Jesus had foretold Peter that he would deny his acquaintance with him 3 times before the cock crew in the morning. Peter denied him as was foretold, the author refers to this event here.
2. Matt. 26:6-75.
3. Mark 14:66-72.
4. Luke 22:55 .

that night, while Mark has reported it differently, saying that Jesus said to Peter that he would deny him three times before the cock crew twice that night.

6. Peter's answer to the maid who first challenged Peter is reported by Matthew as: "I know not what thou sayest."[1] While according to John he only said, "I am not."[2] Mark, on the other hand, has reported it in these words: "I know not, neither understand I what thou sayest."[3] And Luke has put it this way: "Woman, I know him not."[4]

7. Peter's second answer is also reported differently by all the Evangelists. According to Matthew ..... Peter denied him with an oath and said, "I do not know the man,"[5] and according to John his answer was, "I am not,"[6] while Mark has just said, "And he denied it again,"[7] and according to Luke his answer was, "Man, I am not."[8]

8. The people who "stood by " at the time of Peter's denial were, according to Mark, outside the palace, while Luke reports them as being, "in the midst of the hall".

Contradiction No. 85

Describing the event of crucifixion of Jesus Luke says:

> And as they led him away, they laid hold upon one Simon, a Cyrenian, coming out of the country, and on him they laid the cross, that he might bear it after Jesus.[9]

1. Matt. 26:70.
2. John 18:25.
3. Mark 15:68.
4. Luke 22:57.
5. Matt. 26:72.
6. John 18:25.
7. Mark 14:70.
8. Luke 22:58.
9. Luke 23:26.

This statement is contradicted by the Gospel of John, where it says that Jesus, bearing his cross himself, went forth to the place of crucifixion.[1]

Contradiction No. 86

The first three Gospels agree that Christ was on the cross at the sixth hour on the day of crucifixion,[2] but contrary to this the Gospel of John reports him to be in the court of Pilate exactly at the sixth hour on the same day.[3]

Contradiction No. 87

The Gospel of Mark says regarding the thieves who were crucified with Jesus:

> And they that were crucified with him reviled him,[4]

while Luke reports that one of them reproached Jesus and the other said,

> Lord remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. Then Jesus replied to him, Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise.[5]

The Urdu translators of the editions 1839, 1840, 1844 and 1846 changed the texts of Matthew and Mark to avoid this difference to the effect that there was only one person who was crucified with Jesus.[6] It is a common practice of Christian schol-

1. John 19:17.
2. Matt. 27:45, Mark 15:23 and Luke 23:44.
3. John 19:14.
4. Mark 15:32.
5. Luke 23:43.
6. The present Urdu Translations, however, describe two men.

ars to change the texts of their Holy scriptures whenever they think they should.

Contradiction No. 88

It is understood from chapters 20 and 21 of Matthew that Jesus arrived in Jerusalem after departing from Jericho,[1] while from John we learn that Jesus, departing from Ephraim, arrived in Bethany, where he stayed for the night.[2]

Contradiction No. 89
The Resurrection of Jesus:

We learn from Matthew[3] that when Mary Magdalene and Mary, the mother of James,[4] arrived near the grave, an angel of God descended from the heaven, and the stone rolled back from the grave and he sat upon it, and said to the women not to fear and go home quickly.[5]

The Gospel of Mark describes this incident as follows:

> Mary Magdalene, and Mary, the mother of James and Salome.... Came unto the sepulchre,.... and when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away.... And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment.[6]

Luke's description of this is :

> And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre, and they entered in and found not the body of

1. Matt. 20:29 and 21:1.
2. John 11:54; 12:1.
3. Matt 27:56.
4. According to the gospels these two women were the followers of Jesus and had come to his grave for prayer.
5. Matt. 28:5,6.
6. Mark 16:1-6.

> the Lord Jesus..... behold, two men stood by them in shining garments.[1]

Contradiction No. 90

It is expressly mentioned in Matthew that after the angels informed the women of Jesus' resurrection, they returned from there, and on the way they met Jesus. Jesus hailed them and asked them to tell the people to go to Galilee where they would see him.[2]

But Luke differs from this statement when he says:

> And returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest. It was Mary Magdalene and Joanna, and Mary, the mother of James and other women that were with them which told these things unto the apostles. And their word seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not.[3]

On the other hand we learn from the Gospel of John[4] that Jesus met Mary Magdalene near the grave.

Contradiction No. 91

The Gospel of Luke says in chapter 11:

> From the blood of Abel, unto the blood of Zacharias which perished between the altar and the temple : Verily I say unto you, it shall be required of this generation.[5]

But we read this in the Book of Ezekiel:

1. Luke 24:2-4.
2. Matt. 28:8-10.
3. Luke 24:9-11.
4. John 20:13-15.
5. Luke 11:51.

> The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him.[1]

However in other places in the Old Testament there are several passages which imply that the children of a man will be accountable for the sins of their father up to three or four generations.

Contradiction No. 92

Paul's first letter to Timothy contains this statement:

> For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God, our Saviour, who will have all the men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the Truth.[2]

This statement is incompatible with, and contradicts, Paul's statement in his second letter to Thessalonians:

> And for this cause, God shall send them strong delusion, that should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.[3]

It may be noted how Paul's two statements contradict each other. The first text gives us to understand that God's aim is to redeem all the men and take them to knowledge of the truth, while the latter statement would have us believe that God sends strong delusions to them so that they believe in falsehood like a

1. Ez. 18:20.
2. 1 Tim. 2:3,4.
3. 2 Thess. 2:11,12.

truth; and God will punish them for that. The Protestants raise the same objection against other religions.[1] .According to them God first deludes them to make them stray from the right path, and then punishes them for unrighteousness.

Contradictions No. 93-6

Acts 9:22 and 26 give a description of Paul's conversion to Christianity.[2] The texts of all three chapters are different in many respects. We intend to give only three discrepancies in this book.

1. We read in Acts this statement:

> And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man.[3]

This statement is contradicted by the following statement:

> And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of him that spoke to me.[4]

The contradiction between "hearing a voice" and "heard not the voice of him" speaks for itself.

2. Again in Chapter 9 we find Paul quoting these words of Jesus:

1. The author of this book refers to the Protestants because they do not believe in God being the creator of evil.
2. It is necessary to note that Paul was first a Jew and was called Saul. He was a great opponent of Christianity. One day, he was going to Damascus to captivate some Christians when suddenly he saw a light shine on him and he heard the voice of Jesus, who invited him to Christianity and he became a Christian. Acts 9:1-5.
3. Acts 9:7.
4. Acts 22:9.

...and the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee, what thou must do.[1]

Chapter 22 also contains this:

> Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do.[2]

But in Chapter 26 we are told a different story:

> But rise, and stand upon thy feet; for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou has seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee. Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee to open their eyes and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the Power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.[3]

It may be noted that according to the first two texts, Jesus did not assign any duty to Paul at this occasion, but he was promised that he would be told after he arrived in Damascus, while the later statement shows that Jesus explained his duties at the time of his appearance.

3. It is understood from the first text that the people who were with Paul stood there silently, while the third text shows them as having fallen onto the ground, and the second text does not mention it at all.

1. Acts 9:7.
2. Acts 22:10.
3. Acts 26:16-18.

Contradiction No. 97

We find in Paul's first letter to Corinthians:

> Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed,[1] and fell in one day three and twenty thousand.[2]

This statement is contradicted by the book of Numbers:

> And those that died in the plague were twenty and four thousand.

One of these two texts must be wrong.

Contradiction No. 98

We read this statement in the book of Acts:

> Then sent Joseph, and called his father Jacob to him, and all his kindred, threescore and fifteen souls.[3]

The above text expressly denotes that Joseph and his children who were with Joseph in Egypt are naturally excluded from this number. In fact, it refers to Jacob and his family, but in Genesis we read:

> And the sons of Joseph which were born of him in Egypt were two souls. All the souls of the house of Jacob which came into Egypt were threescore and ten.[4]

1. The commentators are unanimous on the point that the event referred to in this text is the one described in the book of Numbers 25:1 and 9. The Israelites, during their stay in Shittin, began to commit fornication and "whoredom" with the daughters of Moab. Hence twenty-four thousand were killed by God in a plague.
2. Cor.10:8.
3. Acts 7:14.
4. Gen. 46:27.

And according to the commentaries of D'Oyly and Richardment the number of the house of Jacob comes to seventy only when Joseph and his two sons are included in it. They enumerate as follows: the children of Leah thirty two souls, of Zilpah sixteen, of Rachel eleven, and of Bilhah seven. They were in all sixty-six souls. They become seventy when Jacob, Joseph and his two sons are included. This means that the above text of the book of Acts is certainly erroneous.

Contradiction No. 99

The death of Judas Iscariot is described both by Matthew and Acts. The two texts disclose serious contradictions in two respects. Firstly according to Matthew, Judas "departed, and went and hanged himself."[1]

While Acts says:

> Now this man (Judas) purchased a field with the reward of iniquity; and falling headlong; he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out.[2]

Secondly, we know from the first text, that chief priests of the temple bought a field with the money left by Judas[3] while the second text clearly says that Judas himself bought a field with that money. Peter in the latter text also adds:

> And it was known unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem.[4]

There are several reasons to believe that the statement made by Matthew is erroneous as compared to Luke, which may be

1. Matt. 27:5.
2. Acts 1:18.
3. And the chief priest took the silver pieces and said, "It is unlawful to put them into the treasury, because it is the price of blood. They bought with them the potter's field, to bury strangers." Matt. 27:6,7

true. We discuss five of these reasons here:

1. It is clear from the text of Matthew[1] that Judas was remorseful about his sin of betrayal, before hanging himself, but this cannot be true as Jesus, at that hour, was in the court of Pilate and not yet sentenced to death.

2. The text shows that Judas had returned the money to the high priests and elders of the Temple. This is also wrong on the same ground that the high priests and elders were all with Pilate at that time and were not present at the temple.

3. The context of Matthew's text clearly indicates that the passage referred to, which lies between the second and ninth verses, does not correspond to the rest of the text.

4. Judas died on the morning of the night in which Jesus was arrested. It seems unlikely that, in such a short time, he should repent and kill himself because he knew, even before the arrest of Jesus, that Jesus would be killed by the Jews.

5. The ninth verse of this text contains a serious error which will be discussed in the section discussing the errors of the Bible.

Contradiction No. 100

The First Letter to John says:

> Jesus Christ, the righteous: and he is the propitiation

1. Matt. 27:4.

for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.[1]

Contrary to this we read in the book of Proverbs:

The wicked shall be ransom for the righteous, and the transgressor for the upright.[2]

The contradiction here needs no comment.

Contradiction No. 101

It is understood from the text of Paul's letter to the Hebrews that one of the commandments of Moses is weak and unprofitable and therefore defective,[3] while Psalm No. 18 says in verse 7, "The law of the Lord is perfect."

Contradiction No. 102

The Gospel of Mark describes the women coming to the grave of Jesus "very early in the morning", while the Gospel of John tells us that only Mary Magdalene came to the grave "when it was yet dark."

Contradiction No. 103

The inscription superscribed on the cross by the Pilate is given differently in all four Gospels. In Matthew it is, "This is Jesus, the king of the Jews."[4]

In the Gospel of Mark it appears as only, "The king of the Jews."[5]

1. 1 John 2:1,2.
2. Prov. 21:18.
3. " For there is verily a disanulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof." Heb. 7:18
4. Matt. 27:37.
5. Mark 15:26.

Luke says that written in letters of Greek, Latin and Hebrew was, "This is the king of the Jews."[1]

And the Gospel of John puts it in these words, "Jesus of Nazareth, the king of the Jews."[2]

It is strange that the evangelists could not record such a short sentence consistently. How then can their records be trusted for detailed and long reports.

Contradiction No. 104

We learn from the Gospel of Mark that Herod believed in the righteousness of John the Baptist, and was pleased with him.[3] He arrested and killed him only for the sake of Herodias (his brother's wife).[4]

Luke, on the other hand, reports that Herod did not persecute John only for the sake of Herodias but also for the reproaches of John regarding his own perversion.[5]

Contradiction No. 105

The three evangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke are unanimous about the description of the names of eleven of the disciples of Jesus, but all the three disagree regarding the name of the twelfth disciple. The names of eleven disciples unanimously mentioned are: Peter, Andrew, James son of Zebedee, John, Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthew, James son of Alpheus, Simon the Canaanite and Judas Iscariot. According to Matthew,

1. Luke 23:38.
2. John 19:19.
3. "Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man, and a Holy... when he heard him, he did many things, and heard him gladly." Mark 6:20.
4. Herodias was the wife of Herod's brother. Herod married her. John opposed him as it was unlawful to marry her. Herod arrested him and then killed him just to please Herodias.
5. "But Herod, the Tetrarch, being reproved by him for Herodias — and for all the evils which Herod had done." Luke 3:19

the name of the twelfth disciple was Lebbeus whose surname was Thaddeus. Mark says it was Thaddaeus. Luke claims it was Judas, the brother of James.

Contradiction No. 106

The first three Evangelists make mention of the man who was sitting at the receipt of custom, and who followed Jesus when he called him. There is, however, considerable disagreement among them regarding his name. According to Matthew his name is Matthew, [1] while Mark says he was Levi, the son of Alpheus, [2] and Luke writes Levi without his father's name.[3]

Contradiction No. 107

We read in Matthew that Jesus considered Peter as the best of his disciples, as Jesus said to him.

> Blessed art thou Simon: .... and I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.[4]

Further in the same chapter, Jesus is reported to have said, to Peter:

> Get thee behind me Satan: thou art an offense unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.[5]

1. Matt. 9:9.
2. Mark 2:14.
3. Luke 5:27.
4. Matt 16:17-19.
5. Matt. 16:23.

Protestant scholars have reproduced many statements of the ancient scholars about Peter's accusation. John, in his commentary on Matthew, said that Peter was arrogant and a man of "feeble intellect". St Augustine said that he was not steadfast and sure, at one time he would believe and at another he would doubt.

Is it not strange and ridiculous that a man of such qualities is promised "the keys of the kingdom of heaven"?

Contradiction No. 108

The Gospel of Luke describes two disciples of Jesus asking him, "Wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did?" Jesus rebuked the two disciples saying, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them."[1] Further on in the same Gospel we find another statement of Jesus, which absolutely contradicts this. It says, "I am come to send fire on earth; and what will I, if it be already kindled?"[2]

Contradiction No. 109

Matthew has reported that the mother of Zebedee's sons had requested Jesus to:

> Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left in thy kingdom.[3]

Mark on the other hand reports that the request was made by Zebedee's sons themselves.[4]

1. Luke 9:54-56.
2. Luke12:49.
3. Matt. 20:21.
4. Mark 10:35.

Contradiction No. 110

The Gospel of Matthew includes a parable of a man who planted a vineyard. At the end of the parable we find :

> " When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen? They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen which shall render him the fruits in their seasons."[1]

Luke, however, has at the end of the parable:

> What therefore shall the lord of the vineyard do unto them? He shall come and destroy these husbandmen, and shall give the vineyard to others. And when they heard it, they said, God forbid.[2]

The texts are obviously contradictory. The second text contradicts the first, by adding, "When they heard it, they said, God forbid!"

Contradiction No. 111

The event of a woman of Bethany, who poured perfumed ointment on the head of Jesus, is described in three gospels.[3] There are several contradictions between the different accounts.

1. Mark[4] reports that this event took place two days before

1. Matt 21:40,41.
2. Luke 20:15,16.
3. The gospels of Matthew, Mark and John have given details of this event. The gist of the story is that Jesus was at the meal in Bethany when a woman came with a costly perfume and poured it on Jesus. The disciples were angry at her for wasting such a costly thing which could help some poor man; Jesus rebuked them for it.
4. Mark 14:1.

the feast of Passover,[1] while John reports it to have happened six days prior to the festival.[2] Matthew is silent regarding the time of this incident.

2. Mark and Matthew agree that Jesus was in the house of Simon the leper when the woman came, while John reports him to be in the house of Lazarus, the brother of Mary.

3. Matthew and Mark agree that the ointment was poured on the head of Jesus,[3] while John contradicts this and says that she anointed the feet of Jesus.[4]

4. Mark says that the people who rebuked the woman were from among the people who were present there at that time, while Matthew has said that they were the disciples of Jesus, and John's version is that the objection was raised by Judas.

5. The three Gospels have quoted Jesus' speech to his disciples on this occasion differently.

The serious contradictions presented by these texts cannot be eliminated by claiming that this event of Jesus' anointment might have taken place a number of times, and each gospel might have reported a different story. The event is clearly the same in each case and the contradictions in the different accounts is clear indication of the usual manipulation in the text.

1. The Passover is a religious festival of the Jews which is celebrated on 14th April every year in the memory of their exodus from Egypt.
2. John 12:1.
3. Matt. 26:7 Mark. 14:3.
4. John 12:3.

Contradiction No. 112

A comparison of the texts of Matthew 22, Luke 26 and Mark 14 regarding the description of The Last Supper,[1] reveals two serious contradictions :

1. There are two cups mentioned in Luke's description, one before the meal and the other after it, while Matthew and Mark speak of only one cup. Apparently Luke's description is erroneous, because this description involves serious objection against the faith of the Catholics who believe that the wine and the bread actually turn into the flesh and the body of Christ.

2 According to Luke, the body of Christ was sacrificed only for the disciples,[2] while Mark reports it to have been sacrificed is given for many,[3] and from Matthew we understand that neither the body, nor the blood of Jesus is shed, but the blood of the New Testament is the thing which is shed for others. How the blood of the New Testament is shed is a riddle.

We are greatly surprised to note that the Gospel of John describes ordinary events like Jesus riding on an ass or applying perfume to his clothes, but does not make any mention of as important an event as the Last Supper which holds such a vital place in Christian ritual.

1. The Last Supper or Eucharist is a sacramental rite of the Christians. According to the Gospels, the origin of this sacrament was an event which took place on the night preceding Jesus' arrest when he was eating a meal with his disciples. He took bread and recited blessings and thanks over it and gave it to the disciples to share among themselves. Then he said, "This is my body which is given for you, this do in remembrance of me." After the supper he took a cup with wine in it and said, "This cup is new testament in my blood, which is shed for you." The Christians have made it a rite that they take a cup of wine and offer their thanks, and break the bread and offer their thanks on it. The Catholics believe that the bread and wine actually turn into the body and flesh of Jesus. The ceremony was named Eucharist, which signifies "thankfulness", by Paul.
2. "This is my body which is given for you." 22:19
3. "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many." 14:24

the feast of Passover,[1] while John reports it to have happened six days prior to the festival.[2] Matthew is silent regarding the time of this incident.

2. Mark and Matthew agree that Jesus was in the house of Simon the leper when the woman came, while John reports him to be in the house of Lazarus, the brother of Mary.

3. Matthew and Mark agree that the ointment was poured on the head of Jesus,[3] while John contradicts this and says that she anointed the feet of Jesus.[4]

4. Mark says that the people who rebuked the woman were from among the people who were present there at that time, while Matthew has said that they were the disciples of Jesus, and John's version is that the objection was raised by Judas.

5. The three Gospels have quoted Jesus' speech to his disciples on this occasion differently.

The serious contradictions presented by these texts cannot be eliminated by claiming that this event of Jesus' anointment might have taken place a number of times, and each gospel might have reported a different story. The event is clearly the same in each case and the contradictions in the different accounts is clear indication of the usual manipulation in the text.

1. The Passover is a religious festival of the Jews which is celebrated on 14th April every year in the memory of their exodus from Egypt.
2. John 12:1.
3. Matt. 26:7 Mark. 14:3.
4. John 12:3.

Contradiction No. 112

A comparison of the texts of Matthew 22, Luke 26 and Mark 14 regarding the description of The Last Supper,[1] reveals two serious contradictions :

1. There are two cups mentioned in Luke's description, one before the meal and the other after it, while Matthew and Mark speak of only one cup. Apparently Luke's description is erroneous, because this description involves serious objection against the faith of the Catholics who believe that the wine and the bread actually turn into the flesh and the body of Christ.

2 According to Luke, the body of Christ was sacrificed only for the disciples,[2] while Mark reports it to have been sacrificed is given for many,[3] and from Matthew we understand that neither the body, nor the blood of Jesus is shed, but the blood of the New Testament is the thing which is shed for others. How the blood of the New Testament is shed is a riddle.

We are greatly surprised to note that the Gospel of John describes ordinary events like Jesus riding on an ass or applying perfume to his clothes, but does not make any mention of as important an event as the Last Supper which holds such a vital place in Christian ritual.

1. The Last Supper or Eucharist is a sacramental rite of the Christians. According to the Gospels, the origin of this sacrament was an event which took place on the night preceding Jesus' arrest when he was eating a meal with his disciples. He took bread and recited blessings and thanks over it and gave it to the disciples to share among themselves. Then he said, "This is my body which is given for you, this do in remembrance of me." After the supper he took a cup with wine in it and said, "This cup is new testament in my blood, which is shed for you." The Christians have made it a rite that they take a cup of wine and offer their thanks, and break the bread and offer their thanks on it. The Catholics believe that the bread and wine actually turn into the body and flesh of Jesus. The ceremony was named Eucharist, which signifies "thankfulness", by Paul.
2. "This is my body which is given for you." 22:19
3. "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many." 14:24

Contradiction No. 113

We read this verse in Matthew:

> Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.[1]

But further in the same Gospel we read of Jesus' saying:

> Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, ... for my yoke is easy and my burden is light.[2]

Contradiction No. 114

We read in chapter 4 of Matthew that the Devil first took Jesus to the Holy City, and set him on the pinnacle of the temple, then took him up to the peak of a mountain. Jesus then went to Galilee. Then leaving Nazareth came to Capernaum and dwelt there.

Luke says in chapter 4 of his Gospel that the Devil first took Jesus onto the mountain then to Jerusalem and then he was stood on the Pinnacle of the Temple, then Jesus returned to Galilee and started teaching there, then he went to Nazareth, where he had been brought up.

Contradiction No. 115

Matthew reports that a Roman officer himself came to Jesus and requested him to heal his servant and said:

> Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof, but speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed.[3]

1. Matt. 7 : 14.
2. Matt. 11:29,30.
3. Matt. 8:8.

Jesus, commending the faith of the officer, said:

> As thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour.[1]

Luke reports this event differently. According to him the centurion himself did not come to Jesus, but sent some elders of the Jews. Then Jesus went with them. When he came near the house:

> ...the centurion sent friends to him saying unto him, Lord, trouble not thyself: for I am not worthy that you shouldest enter under my roof. Wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee: but say in a word, and my servant shall be healed.[2]

Then Jesus praised the officer, and the people who were sent by the officer returned to his house, the servant had been healed.

Contradiction No. 116

Matthew reports in chapter 8 that a scribe came to Jesus and asked his permission to follow him wherever he went. Then a disciple said to him that first he should go and bury his father and then follow Jesus. Matthew describes many events after this, and in chapter 17 reports the event of the Transfiguration[3] of Jesus. Luke, on the other hand, reports the request of the scribe in chapter 9 after the Transfiguration. One of the two texts must be wrong.

1. Matt. 8:13.
2. Luke 7 : 6,7.
3. The Transfiguration took place on a mountain. Jesus, along with Peter, James and Jacob, went there and he was transfigured before there eyes, and his face shone like the sun. He was seen talking with Moses and Elias. A bright cloud overshadowed them, and a voice was heard, "This is my son in whom I am well pleased." Matt. 17:5. This event is also known as the descent of the Holy Ghost.

Contradiction No. 117

Matthew talks in chapter 9 of a dumb man possessed by devil who is healed by Jesus. Then in chapter 10 he describes the mission of the disciples and Jesus commanding to them to heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead and cast out devils. Then in other chapters he describes many other events and then in chapter 17 the event of the Transfiguration. Luke, on the other hand, first describes the mission of the disciples, then the Transfiguration of Jesus in the same chapter and then after the description of many other events in chapters 9, 10 and 11 he has the report of the dumb man healed by Jesus.

Contradiction No. 118

Mark states that the Jews crucified Christ at the third hour of the day.[1] This statement is contradicted by the Gospel of John which reports that Jesus was in the court of Pilate until sixth hour of the day.[2]

Contradiction No. 119

It is understood from the descriptions of Matthew and Mark that the soldiers who mocked Jesus and put the scarlet rope on him were Pilate's soldiers not Herod's, while Luke's statement is just the opposite.

1. Mark 15:25.
2. John 9:14.

THE ERRORS

This section contains the errors mistakes and contradictions of the Biblical Text that are in addition to the ones discussed previously.

Error No. 1

It is stated in the Book of Exodus that the period that the Israelites stayed in Egypt was 430 years, which is wrong. The period was 215 years.[1] This error is admitted by the historians and the biblical commentators.

Error No. 2

It appears in the Book of Numbers that the total number of the Israelites, who were 20 years of age or over, was six hundred thousand, while all the males and females of the Levites and the women and children of all the other tribes are not included in this number. This statement is highly exaggerated and erroneous.

Error No. 3

The statement of Deuteronomy 23:2, "A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord..." is wrong, as has already been discussed in Part One.

Error No. 4.

In Genesis 46:15 the phrase "thirty and three" is certainly wrong, thirty-four is the correct number. The details of this error

1 Ex.12:40.

have been given in part one under the tenth argument on page twenty-seven.

Error No. 5

I Samuel contains this statement "...fifty thousand, three score and ten men."[1] The number fifty thousand in this verse is wrong as will be discussed later.

Errors No. 6 and 7

2 Samuel 15:7 contains the words "forty years" and in the next verse of the same chapter the name "Geshur" is mentioned. Both are wrong. The correct words are "four years" and "Adom" respectively.

Error No. 8

It is stated in 2 Chronicles:

> And the porch that was on the front of the house, the length of it was according to the breadth of the house, twenty cubits, and height was a hundred and twenty.[2]

This is an exaggerated and erroneous account of the height. According to 1 Kings the height of the porch was thirty cubits.[3] Adam Clarke in volume 2 of his commentary expressly admitted the error in this statement and said that the height was twenty cubits.

1 1 Sam. 6:19.
2 2 Chr. 3:4.
3 1 Kings 6:2.

Error No. 9

The Book of Joshua, describing the borders of the land given to the children of Benjamin, states:

> And the border was drawn thence and compassed the corner of the sea southward.[1]

The word "sea" in this statement is wrong as there was no sea near their land. The commentators D'Oyby and Richardment acknowledged this fact and said, that the Hebrew word which was translated as "sea" actually signified "west".

Error No. 10

In Chapter 19 of the Book of Joshua, under the description of the borders of Naphtali, we read:

> And reacheth to Asher on the west side and to Judah upon Jordan toward the sun rising.[2]

This statement is also wrong as the land of Judah extended towards the South. Adam Clarke also pointed out this error in his commentary.

Errors No. 11-13

The commentator Horseley remarked that verses 7 and 8 of Chapter 3 of the Book of Joshua are wrong.

Error No. 12

The Book of Judges contains this statement:

1 Josh. 18:14.
2 Josh. 19:36.

> And there was a young man out of Bethlehem-Judah, of the family of Judah, who was a Levite.

In this statement the phrase, "who was a Levite", cannot be true because anyone belonging to the family of Judah cannot be Levite. The commentator Horseley also acknowledged this error, and Houbigant even excluded this passage from his text.

Error No. 13

We read this statement in 2 Chronicles:

> And Abijah set the battle in array with an army of valiant men of war even four hundred thousand chosen men: Jeroboam also set the battle in array against him, with eight hundred thousand chosen men, being mighty men of valour.[1]

Further in the same chapter it gives this description:

> And Abijah and his people slew them with a great slaughter: and so there fell down slain of Israel five hundred thousand chosen men.[2]

The numbers mentioned in the two texts are wrong. The commentators of the Bible have admitted the error. The Latin translators changed four hundred thousand to forty thousand, and eight hundred thousand to eighty thousand, and five hundred thousand to fifty thousand men.

Error No. 14

It is stated in 2 Chronicles:

1. 2 Chr. 13:3.
2. 2 Chr. 13:17.

For the Lord brought Judah low because of Ahaz, King of Israel.[1]

The word Israel in this statement is certainly wrong, because Ahaz was the King of Judah and not the the King of Israel. The Greek and the Latin translations, therefore, have replaced Israel with Judah which is an open distortion of the text of their Holy Scriptures.

Error No. 15

We find this statement in 2 Chronicles:

> ...and made Zedekiah, his brother, king over Judah and Jerusalem.

The words "his brother" are incorrect in this statement. It should say his uncle or his father's brother.[2] The Arabic and the Greek translators have replaced "his brother" with "his father's brother", another example of blatant manipulation of the text of the Holy scriptures. Ward says in his book words to this effect, "Since it was not correct, it has been changed to uncle in the Greek and other translations."

Error No. 16

The name "Hadarezer" is wrongly spelled in 2 Samuel 10:16-19 in three places and in 1 Chronicles 18:3-10 in seven places, whereas the correct spelling is Hadadezer (as given in all other references in the Old Testament).

1. 2 Chr. 28:19.
2. We do find the words, "his father's brother" in 2 Kings 24:17, and this is correct because Jehoiachin was the son of Jehoiakim. He would have been known as Zedekiah, the son of Jehoiakim, while in fact he is called Zedekiah, the son of Josiah. See Jer. 26:1 and 27:1.

Errors No. 17-19

Another name "Achan" is given wrongly in the Book of Joshua.[1] The correct name is Achar, with an 'r' at the end.[2]

Error No. 18

We find in 1 Chronicles 3:5 under the description of the sons of David, "Bath-shua, the daughter of Ammiel". The correct name is, "Bath-sheba, the daughter of Eliam, the wife of Uriah".[3]

Error No. 19

The Second Book of Kings[4] gives the name "Azariah" which is certainly wrong. It should be "Uzziah", as can be ascertained from several other sources.[5]

Error No. 20

The name "Jehoahaz", which appears in 2 Chronicles,[6] is not correct. It should be "Ahaziah". Horne admits that the names we have pointed out in errors No. 16-20 are all wrong and then adds that there are some other places in the scriptures where names have been written erroneously.

1. Josh. 7:18.
2. He was a man from the tribe of Judah. The name appears correctly as Achar in 1 Chronicles 2:7.
3. 2 Sam. 11:3.
4. 2 Kings 14:21.
5. See 2 Chr. 26:1, 2 Kings 15:13,30,32 and 34.
6. 2 Chr. 21:17.

Error No. 21

2 Chronicles[1] gives an account of how Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, bound Jehoiakim in chains and deported him to Babylon. This statement is certainly not true. The fact is that he killed him in Jerusalem and ordered his body to be thrown outside the city wall and left unburied.

The historian Josephus says in Volume 10 of his book:

> The King of Babylon came with a great army and captured the city without resistance. He killed all the young men of the city. Jehoiakim was one of them. He threw his body outside the city wall. His son Jehoiachin was made the king. He imprisoned three thousand men. The Prophet Ezekiel was among the captives.

Error No. 22

According to the Arabic versions of 1671 and 1831, the Book of Isaiah (7:8) contains this statement:

> ...and within three score and five years shall Aram be broken.

While the Persian translation and English version says:

> ...and within three score and five years shall Ephraim be broken.

Historically this prophecy was proved false, as in the sixth year of Hezekiah's reign,[2] the King of Assyria invaded Ephraim, as is recorded in 2 Kings in Chapters 17 and 18. Thus Aram was

1. 2 Chr. 36:6.
2. "Even in the sixth year of Hezekiah, that is the ninth year of Hoshea's king of Israel, Samaria was taken. And the king of Assyria did carry away Israel unto Assyria." 2 Kings 18:10,11

destroyed in twenty-one years.[1]

Vitringa, a celebrated Christian scholar, said:

> There has been a mistake in copying the text here. In fact, it was sixteen and five years, and the period referred to was sixteen years after the reign of Ahaz and five after that of Hezekiah.

There is no justification for the opinion of this writer, but at least, he has admitted the error in this text.

Error No. 23

The Book of Genesis says:

> But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.[2]

This statement is clearly wrong since Adam, after eating from that tree, did not die that very day but lived for more than nine hundred years after it.

Error No. 24

We find in the book of Genesis:[3]

> My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: his days shall be an hundred and twenty years.

1. Because Isaiah had predicted this in the reign of Ahaz (Isaiah 7:1) and the period between the reign of Ahaz and of Hoshea is 12 years (2 Kings 17:1) and nine years after his succession to throne, the fall of Ephraim was completed. This makes it twenty-one years contrary to the prediction which says sixty-five years.
2. Gen. 2 :17.
3. Gen. 6:3.

To say that the age of man is a hundred and twenty years is erroneous, as we know that the men of earlier ages lived far longer - Noah's age, for instance, was nine hundred and fifty, Shem, his son, lived for six hundred years and Arphaxad for three hundred and thirty-eight years; while the life-span of present-day man is usually seventy or eighty years.

Error No. 25

Genesis reports this address of God to Abraham:

> And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God.

This statement is again historically wrong, since all the land of Canaan was never possessed by Abraham nor has it been under the everlasting rule of his descendants. On the contrary this land has seen innumerable political and geographical revolutions.

Errors No. 26, 27, 28

The Book of Jeremiah says:

> The word that came to Jeremiah, concerning all the people of Judah in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, the son of Josiah, king of Judah, that was the first year of Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon.

Further in the same chapter it says:

> And this whole land shall be desolation, and an astonishment: and these nations shall serve the king of

Babylon seventy years. And it shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith the Lord, for their iniquity, and the land of Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations.[1]

And further in Chapter 29 of the same book, it states:

Now these are the words of the letter that Jeremiah the Prophet sent from Jerusalem unto the residue of the elders which were carried away captives, and to the priests, and to the prophets, and to all the people whom Nebuchadnezzar had carried away captives from Jerusalem to Babylon; (After that Jeconiah, the king and the queen, and the eunuchs, the princes of Judah and Jerusalem, and the carpenters, and the smiths were deported from Jerusalem;)[2]

And further in the same chapter we read:

For thus saith the Lord, that after seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you and perform my good word to you in causing you to return to this place.[3]

In the Persian translation of 1848 we find these words:

After seventy years be accomplished in Babylon, I will turn towards you.

Further in chapter 52 of the same book we find the following statement:

1. Jer. 25:1 and 11,12.
2. Jer. 29:1,2.
3. Jer. 29:10.

> This is the people whom Nebuchadrezzar carried away captive in the seventh year, three thousand Jews and three and twenty: In the eighteenth year of Nebuchadrezzar, he carried away captive from Jerusalem eight hundred and thirty and two persons: in the three and twentieth year of Nebuchadrezzar Nebuzar-adan the captain of the guard carried away captive of the Jews seven hundred forty and five persons: all the persons were four thousand and six hundred.[1]

After a careful reading of the several passages quoted above the following three points are established:

1. Nebuchadnezzar ascended the throne in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim. That is historically correct. The Jewish historian Josephus said in Vol. 10 and Chapter 5 of his history that Nebuchadnezzar ascended the throne of Babylon in the fourth year of Jehoiakim. It is, therefore, necessary that the first year of Nebuchadnezzar must coincide with the fourth year of Jehoiakim.
2. Jeremiah sent his words (the book) to the Jews after the deportation of Jeconiah, the king, the elders of Judah and other artisans to Babylon.
3. The cumulative number of the captives in the three exiles was four thousand and six hundred, and that the third exile by Nebuchadnezzar took place in the twenty-third year of his reign.

This reveals three obvious errors. Firstly, according to the historians, Jeconiah, the elder of Judah, and other artisans were exiled to Babylon in 599 B.C. The author of *Meezan-ul-Haq* printed in 1849 says on page 60, that this exile took place in 600 B.C. and Jeremiah sent the letter after their departure to

1. Jer. 52:28-30.

Babylon. According to the Biblical text quoted above their stay in Babylon should be seventy years, which is certainly not true, because the Jews were released by the order of the king of Persia in 536 B.C. This means that their sojourn in Babylon was only sixty-three years and not seventy years. We have quoted these figures from the book *Murshid-ut-Talibeen* printed in Beirut in 1852 which is different s from the edition printed in 1840 in several places. We find the following table in the 1852 edition.

THE YEAR OF THE CREATION	THE EVENT	THE YEAR BEFORE CHRIST BC
3405	Jeremiah's writing to the captives of Babylon	599
3468	The death of Darius, the uncle of Koreish, the ascension of Cyrus to the throne of Babylon, Madi and Pharus. His orders to release the Jews and send them back to Jerusalem	536

Secondly, the cumulative number of those exiled during the three exiles is mentioned as four thousand and six hundred people, while according to 2 Kings the number of captives, including the princes and the brave men of Jerusalem, at the time of the first exile, was three thousand, the craftsmen and the smiths not being included in this number.[1]

Thirdly, from the text quoted above, we understand that the

1. "And he carried away all Jerusalem, and all the princes, and all the mighty men of valour, even three thousand captives, and all the craftsmen and smiths." 2 Kings 24:14

third captivity took place in the twenty-third year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign whereas this is contradicted in 2 Kings which says that Nebuzar-adan took them captive in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar.[1]

Error No. 29

The Book of Ezekiel contains the following words:

> And it came to pass in the eleventh year, in the first day of the month, that the word of the Lord came unto me.[2]

And later in the same chapter we find:

> For thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will bring upon Tyrus Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, a king of kings, from the north, with horses, and with chariots, and with horsemen and companies, and much people.
>
> He shall slay with the sword thy daughters in the field, and he shall make a fort against thee, and cast a mount against thee, and lift up the buckler against thee;
>
> And he shall set the engines of war against thy walls, and with his axes he shall break down thy towers.
>
> By reason of the abundance of his horses their dust shall cover thee, thy walls shall shake at the noise of the horsemen, and of the wheels, and of the chariots, when he shall enter into thy gates, as men enter into a city wherein is made a breach.
>
> With the hoofs of his horses shall he tread down all thy streets; he shall slay thy people by the sword, and thy strong garrisons shall go down to the ground.
>
> And they shall make a spoil of thy riches, and make

1. "...the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, came Nebuzar-adan..."
2. Kings 25:8.
2. Ezek. 26:1.

> a prey of thy merchandise, and they shall break down thy walls, and destroy thy pleasant houses, and they shall lay thy stones and thy timber and thy dust in the midst of thy water.[1]

History proved this prediction false because Nebuchadnezzar tried his best to capture the city of Tyrus, and kept the city in a state of siege for thirteen years, but had to go back without success. Since it is inconceivable that God's promise would not be fulfilled, it must be that the prediction itself is misreported.

In Chapter 29, we find the following words attributed to Ezekiel:

> And it came to pass in the seven and twentieth year, in the first month, in the first day of the month, the word of the Lord came unto me saying,
>
> Son of man, Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon caused his army to serve a great service against Tyrus; every head was made bald, and every shoulder was peeled: yet he had no wages, nor his army, for Tyrus...
>
> ...thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I will give the land of Egypt unto Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon; and he shall take her multitude, and take her spoil, and take her prey; and it shall be the wages for his army.
>
> I have given him the land of Egypt for his labour wherewith he served against it...[2]

The above text expressly states that since Nebuchadnezzar could not get the reward of his siege of Tyrus, God promises to give him the land of Egypt.

1. Ezek. 26:7-12.
2. Ezek. 29:17-20.

Error No. 30

The Book of Daniel contains this statement:

> Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, how long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot?
>
> And he said unto me, unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.[1]

The Judaeo-Christian scholars, from the very beginning, have wondered about the significance of this prediction. Almost all the Judaeo-Christian commentators of the Bible are of the opinion that it is Antiochus, the consul of Rome who invaded Jerusalem in 161 BC, who is referred to in this vision,[2] and the days mean the usual days of our calendar. Josephus, the famous commentator, also agreed with this opinion.

Historically, however, this opinion does not hold water, because the occupation of the sanctuary and host, lasted for three and a half years, whereas the period of two thousand and three hundred days referred to comes to six years, three months and nineteen days. For the same reason Issac Newton rejected the assumption that Antiochus had to do anything with this vision.

Thomas Newton who wrote a commentary on the predictions and prophesies of the Bible first quoted several other commentators on this point, and then, like Isaac Newton, completely rejected the possibility of it being Antiochus who is referred to in this vision of Hezekiah. He asserted that the Roman emperors

1. Dan. 8:13.
2. According to 1 Maccabees 1:59 Antiochus invaded Jerusalem in 168 B.C and not 161 BC.

and the Popes are the import of the vision.

Snell Chauncy also wrote a commentary on the predictions of the Bible which was published in 1838. He claimed that in his commentary he incorporated the essence of eighty five other commentaries. Commenting on this vision he said that from the earliest times it has been very difficult for the scholars to ascertain and define the time of the commencement of the event to which this vision refers.[1]

The majority of the scholars have concluded that the time of its commencement is certainly one of four periods in which four royal commands were issued by the Kings of Persia:

1. Cyrus, who issued his ordinance in 636 B.C.
2. The king Darius, who issued his orders in 815 B.C.
3. Ardashir, who gave his commands about Ezra in 458 B.C.
4. The king Ardashir, who issued his ordinance to Nehemiah in the twentieth year of his reign in 444 B.C.

He also added that the days mentioned in this vision are not days as usually understood, but days signifying years. Keeping this in mind Snell Chauncy said, the ending of the period of this vision would be as follows:

1. According to the first command of Cyrus it would end in 1764 A.D.
2. According to the second of Darius it would end in 1782 A.D.
3 .According to the third command of Ardashir it would be

1. As far as we understand Snell Chauncy interpreting the days of this vision as years has presumed that the vision foretold the reappearance of the Christ Jesus. The two thousand three hundred days are assumed to be years. This number of years should be counted from any of the occasions when Jerusalem has been taken out of the possession of Judaeo-Christian followers.

1843 A.D.

4. According to the fourth ordinance it would end in 1856.

All these dates passed without the prophecy being fulfilled and, in any case, this illogically metaphorical interpretation is not acceptable.

Firstly it is a mis-statement to say that it would be difficult for scholars to ascertain the period of its commencement. The difficulty lies only in the fact that the period should start right from the time when this vision was shown to Daniel not from any period after it.

Next an arbitrary change in meaning of days into years is not acceptable, because the word, "day" continues to mean the usual period of 24 hours unless otherwise indicated by the writer himself. The word is used in both the Old and the New Testaments in its usual meaning and never means "year". Even if we accept that the word might have been used to mean "year" it would have been in a figurative sense; but a figurative use of a word requires some strong indication of it. In the account of this vision the word "day" has been used for the purpose of defining a period of time and we do not find any indication that it should be taken in a figurative sense. Most scholars have, therefore, accepted it in its usual meaning otherwise scholars like Isaac Newton, Thomas Newton and Snell Chauncy would not have tried to put forward such confusing explanations.

Error No. 31

The Book of Daniel[1] states:

> And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate

1. Dan. 12:11,12 .

set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days.

Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days.

This prophecy is similar to the one previously discussed which never came true. Neither Christ nor the Messiah of the Jews appeared within this period.

Error No. 32

The Book of Daniel contains this statement:

> Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.[1]

This prophecy is also wrong as the Messiah did not appear in this period. None of the explanations forwarded by the Christian scholars in this regard deserve any serious consideration, partly for the reasons we have already discussed and partly on account of a number of facts we discuss below:-

Firstly the period between the first year of the reign of Cyrus, the year of the release of the Jews as confirmed by Ezra[2] and the birth of the Prophet Jesus is nearly six hundred years according to Josephus and five hundred and thirty-six years in Snell Chauncy's estimation.

Secondly, if we accept this as a correct explanation, it would mean that all true dreams have come to an end for ever, which is

1. Dan. 9:24.
2. Ezra 1:1.

obviously untrue. Watson, in the third part of his book, has reproduced Dr. Grib's letter who said, "The Jews have so much distorted the text of this prophecy that it has been rendered inapplicable to Jesus." This confession by Watson is enough to confirm our contention that this prediction, according to the original copy of the Book of Daniel, still preserved with the Jews, which is free from the objection of any kind of manipulation, that this prophecy is inapplicable to Jesus.

Thirdly, the word "Christ", meaning anointed, has been used for all the kings of the Jews irrespective of their character or deeds. It appears in Psalm 18 verse 50. Similarly, David is mentioned as the anointed in Psalm 131. And also 1 Samuel contains this statement of David regarding King Saul, who is said to have been one of the worst kings of the Jews:

> Behold this day thine eyes have seen how that the Lord hath delivered thee into mine hand in the cave: and some bade me to kill thee: but mine eye spared thee; and I said, I will not put forth mine hand against my lord, for he is the Lord's anointed.[1]

The same application of this word is also found in 1 Samuel 24 and 2 Samuel 1. Besides, this word is not only limited to the kings of the Jews. We find it being used for other kings too. It is stated in Isaiah:

> Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden.[2]

Cyrus, the king of Persia, is mentioned as God's anointed or the Christ in this text. Cyrus is the one who liberated the Jews

1. 1 Sam. 24:10.
2. Isaiah 45:1.

from their captivity and allowed the Temple to be rebuilt.

Error No. 33

The following statement is given through the Prophet David in 2 Samuel:

> Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime.
>
> And as since the time that I commanded judges to be over my people Israel.[1]

The same prediction appeared in slightly different words in the Persian translation of 1835. According to this text God had promised them that they would live in peace there, without any affliction to them at the hands of wicked people. This promised place was Jerusalem, where they made their habitations and lived. History has proved that this promise was not fulfilled. They were severely afflicted at the hands of several rulers. Nebuchadnezzar invaded them three times and slaughtered them, captured them and deported them to Babylon. Titus,[2] the Emperor of Rome, persecuted them so barbarously that one million of the Jews were killed, a hundred thousand people were hanged and ninety-nine thousand were imprisoned. Up to this day their descendants are living in degradation around the world.

1. 2 Sam. 7:10.
2. Titus, king of Rome 40-81 A.D. He captured Jerusalem in the month of September in 70 A.D. after a long siege, and destroyed it.

Error No. 34

In 2 Samuel we read the following promise of God to David:

> And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will stablish his kingdom.
>
> He shall build an house for my name, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever.
>
> I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with stripes of the children of men;
>
> But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul whom I put away before thee.
>
> And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee; thy throne shall be established for ever.[1]

Another statement of similar nature is given in I Chronicles:

> Behold, a son shall be born to thee, who shall be a man of rest: and I will give him rest from all his enemies round about: for his name shall be Solomon, and I will give peace and quietness unto Israel in his days.
>
> He shall build a house for my name: and he shall be my son,... and I will establish the throne of his kingdom over Israel for ever.[2]

Although, God had promised everlasting kingdom in the family of David, this promise was not fulfilled, as the family of David was deprived of the kingdom, a long time ago.

1. 2 Sam 7:12-16.
2. 1 Chr. 22:9-10.

Error No. 35

Paul reported God's word regarding the prominence of Jesus over the angels in his letter to the Hebrews:[1]

> I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son.[2]

Christian scholars have claimed that this is a reference to the verses in 2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles discussed in the previous paragraph. This claim is not acceptable for several reasons.

1. The text of Chronicles is unambiguous saying that the son's name will be Solomon.

2. Both the texts say that he would build a house in the name of God. This can only be applied to Solomon who built the house of God, as promised. Jesus, on the other hand was born one thousand and three years after the construction of this house and used to talk of its destruction. This will be discussed under Error No.79.

3. Both predictions foretold that he would be a king , whereas Jesus was not a king, on the contrary he was a poor man as he himself said:

> And Jesus saith unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the son of man hath not where to lay his head.[3]

1. Heb. 1:5.
2. To prove the greatness of Jesus over the angels, Paul argued that God never said to any of the angels that any of them was His Son. He only said it to Jesus that, "I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son."
3. Mat:8:20.

4. It is clearly stated in the first prediction that:

> If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men.

This implies that he will be a man of iniquitous nature. According to the Christians - and they are far from the truth - Solomon was a man of that nature and gave up the prophethood and became an apostate in his last days, indulging in idol worship, building temples for the idols, and committing himself to heathenism.[1] Whereas Jesus was absolutely innocent, and could not commit a sin of any kind.

5. In the text of Chronicles it says clearly:

> Who shall be a man of rest, and I will give him rest from all his enemies round about.

However, Jesus, according to the Christians, was never in peace right from his early days up to the time of the crucifixion. He lived in constant fear of the Jews and left one place for another until he was arrested by them and, they say, killed. Solomon, on the other hand, fulfilled the condition of living in rest from his enemies.

6. In the prediction of Chronicles the Israelites are promised:

> I will give peace and quieteness unto Israel in his days.

Whereas it is historically known to everyone that the Jews were servile to and dominated by the Romans in the time of Jesus.

1. See I Kings 11 and Nehemiah 13 : 26.

7. The Prophet Solomon, himself has claimed that the prediction was made about him. This is clear from 2 Chronicles.[1]

Although the Christians agree that these tidings were for Solomon, they say that it was in fact for Jesus too, as he was a descendant of Solomon. We contend that this is a false claim because the attributes of the predicted son must coincide with the description of the prophecy. We have already shown that Jesus does not fulfill the requirements of the prediction.

Apart from this, Jesus cannot be the subject of this prediction, even according to the Christian scholars. In order to remove the contradiction between the genealogical descriptions of Jesus in Mathew and Luke, they have said that Matthew described the genealogy of Joseph of Nazareth, while Luke described the genealogy of Mary. However, Jesus was not the son of Joseph, but rather the son of Mary, and according to her genealogy Jesus is the descendant of Nathan, son of David, and not the son of Solomon.

Error No. 36

It is said regarding the Prophet Elijah in I Kings:

> And the word of Lord came unto him, saying,
> Get thee hence, and turn thee eastward, and hide thyself by the brook Cherith, that is before Jordan.
> And it shall be, that thou shalt drink of the brook; and I have commanded the ravens to feed thee there.
> So he went and did according unto the word of the Lord: for he went and dwelt by the brook Cherith, that is

1. "But the Lord said to David my father, Forasmuch as it was in thine heart to build a house for my name, thou didst well in that it was in thine heart: Not withstanding thou shalt not build the house; but thy son which shall come forth out of thy loins, he shall build the house for my name. The Lord therefore hath performed his word that he hath spoken: for I am risen up in the room of David my father." 2 Chr. 6:8-10.

before Jordan,

And the ravens brought him bread and flesh in the morning, and bread and flesh in the evening, and he drank of the brook.[1]

In the above text the word 'raven' is a translation of the original word *'arem'*. All the translators except Jerome have translated it as 'raven', only Jerome has translated it differently as "Arab". Since his opinion did not gain popularity, his followers distorted the texts in Latin translations and changed the word 'Arab' to raven. This has been much laughed at by non-Christian scholars. Horne, a famous scholar, was much surprised at it and was, in fact, inclined to agree with Jerome in that the word *'arem'* most likely signifies 'Arab' and not raven. He greatly criticised the other translators and gave three arguments to prove the absurdity of their opinion. He said on page 639 of the first volume of his commentary:[2]

Some critics have censured the translators saying that it is far from being true that crows should provide sustenance to a Prophet. If they had seen the original word, they would not have reproached them, because the original word is 'Orim' which has the meaning of 'Arab'. This word is used for the same purpose in 2 Kings 21 and in Nehemiah 4.

Besides, it is understood from *'Perechat Riba'*, an exegesis of the Book of Genesis, that this prophet was commanded to live and hide himself in a place in the vicinity of 'Butshan'. Jerome said that the 'Orim' were the residents of that town which was within the limits of Arabia. They provided food for this prophet.

1. I Kings:17:2-6
2. We give the contents, abridged in our own words.

This is a valuable finding and evidence for Jerome. Although the Latin translations contain the word 'raven', the Book of Chronicles, the Book of Nehemiah and Jerome have translated it as 'Arab'. Similarly it is indicated by the Arabic translation that this word signified men, and not crows. The famous Jewish commentator Jarchi also translated this word as 'Arab'. It is certainly not likely that God would have provided bread and flesh to his prophet through such impure birds. A prophet like Elijah, who was so strict a follower of the commandments of God would not be satisfied with flesh provided by crows unless he knew beforehand that the crows were not bringing carrion. Elijah was provided with such flesh and bread for a whole year. How could this kind of service be attributed to crows? It is much more likely the inhabitants of 'Orbo' or 'Arabs' rendered this service to him."

It is up to the Protestants now to decide which of the two opinions is correct.

Error No. 37

We find the following statement in I Kings:

> ...in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month Zif, which is the second month, that he began to build the house of Lord.[1]

According to the historians, this statement is incorrect. Adam Clarke, for example, said, when commenting on this verse in Vol. 2 of his commentary:

1. I Kgs. 6:1

The historians have differred from this text in the following details: The Hebrew text gives 480, Latin 440, Glycas 330, Melchior Canus 590; Josephus 592, Slipicius Severus 585, Clement Alexander 570, Cedrenus 672 Codomanus 598, Vosius Capellus 580, Seranius 680, Nicholas Abraham 527, Mastlinus 592, Petavius and Watherus 520.

Had the year, described by the Hebrew text been correct and revealed by God, the Latin translator and so many of the Judeao-Christian historians would have not contradicted it. Josephus and Clement Alexandrianus also differed from the Hebrew text, even though both of them are known as staunch believers in their religion. This, naturally, leads us to believe that the biblical text was to them no more worthy of respect than any other book of history. Otherwise they would have not even thought of disagreeing with it.

Error No. 38

It is stated in Matthew:

> So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David until the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations; and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations.[1]

According to this statement the genealogy of Jesus from Abraham is subdivided into three groups, each consisting of fourteen generations. It is obviously not correct, because since the first group from Abraham to David, includes David in it, he must be excluded from the second group as he cannot be

1. Matt. I:17

counted twice. The second group should start with Solomon and end with Jeconias, thus excluding him from the third group. The third group should start from Salathiel, which leaves only 13 generations in the last group. All of the ancient as well as modern scholars have criticized this error, but the Christian scholars are unable to produce any convincing explanation for it.

Errors No. 39-42:

According to the Arabic translation printed in 1849, describing the genealogy of the Christ, the Gospel of Matthew states:

> Josias begat Jeconias and his brethren, in the captivity of Babylon.[1]

It can be understood from this text that Jeconias and his brothers were born in the period of exile in Babylon, which obviously implies that Josias was alive during that period. However this cannot be the case for the following four reasons:

1. Josias had died twelve years before the exile, because after his death his son Jehoahaz became king and ruled for three months. Then Jehoiachin, another son of Josias reigned for eleven years. And it was only when Jeconias, the son of Jehoiakim. had been ruling for three months in Jerusalem, that Nebuchadnezzar invaded Jerusalem and imprisoned him along with all other Israelites and deported them to Babylon.[2]
2. Jeconias is the grandson of Josias, and not his son, as is clear from the above statement.
3. At the time of exile, Jeconias was 18 years old,[3] therefore

1. Matt. 1:11.
2. See 2 Chr. 35:23, 36:1,2,59 and 2 Kgs. 23:30,31,36 and 24:8.
3."Jehoiachin was eighteen years old when he began to reign". 2 Kings: 24:8.

his birth in this period is out of the question.

4. Jeconias had no brothers but his father had three brothers.

In view of the above textual difficulties, the commentator Adam Clarke reported in his commentaries that:

> Calmet suggested that this verse should be read as follows: "Josiah begat Jehoiakin, and his brethren, Jehoiakin begat Jeconiah about the time of carrying away to Babylon."

This suggestion[1] of manipulating the text of the holy scriptures is something to be noted by the reader. Even after this change, our objection discussed in no. 3 above remains unaffected.

In our opinion, some ingenious priests have deliberately deleted the word Jehoiakin from the text to avoid the objection that Jesus, being a descendant of Jehoiakin, would not be able to sit on the throne of David,[2] and that in this case it would no longer be possible for him to be the Messiah.[3]

They did not appreciate the implications that were to occur as a result of this tiny change in the text. Perhaps they thought it

1. This suggestion has been partially carried out. The suggestion said that Jehoiachin should be inserted within the text and that instead of the phrase " in the captivity" it should be, "about the time of..." So the translators have manipulated the text, and in almost all the translations the text now reads: " Josias begat Jeconias and his brethren, about the time they were carried away to Babylon."

By adding the phrase "about the time" they have tried to avoid the objection that the author raised in no.3 above.

In the English translation published by the Anglican Church in 1961, this difficulty has been solved a bit differently. In this translation the verse reads:
"And Josias was the father of Jecohias and his brethren at the time of the deportation to Babylon."

2. "Therefore, thus saith the lord of Jehoiakin king of Judah, he shall have none to sit upon the throne of David." Jer. 36:30

3. According to Bible it is necessary for the Messiah to be a descendant of David.

was easier to lay blame on Matthew than to preclude Jesus from being the descendant of David and from his being the Messiah.

Error No. 43

The genealogical description in Matthew records seven generations between Judah and Salmon,[1] and five generations from Salmon to David. The period from Judah to Salmon is about three hundred years, and from Salmon to David four hundred years. Even bearing in mind the long lives of those people, this statement cannot be true, as the age of the first group of generations was longer than the second group. Matthew's description puts seven generations in three hundred years, and five generations in four hundred years.

Error No. 44

The second of the three groups of fourteen generations described by Matthew in the genealogy of Jesus, has in fact eighteen generations and not the fourteen mentioned in the third chapter of I Chronicles. Newman expressed great concern about this and mocked it saying that so far it had only been necessary to believe in the parity of one and three, now it was necessary to believe in the parity of eighteen and fourteen, because the holy scriptures cannot be thought of as being incorrect.

Errors No. 45 & 46

In the same passage of Matthew we read:

1. According to this the generations from David to Jeconias are as follows: David, Solomon, Roboam, Abia, Asa, Josaphat, Joram, Ozias, Joatham, Achaz, Ezekias, Manasses, Amon, Josias, Jehoiachin, and Jeconias, whereas Matthew records thirteen generations which is wrong. Matt. 1:6-11

Jehoram begat Uzziah.

This statement is incorrect for two reasons:

1. It claims that Uzziah was the son of Jehoram which is not true, because Uzziah was the son of Ahaziah, son of Joash who was the son of Amaziah, son of Joram. These are the three generations which have been left out by Matthew perhaps to make them fourteen. These three were kings of repute. They are mentioned in Chapters 8, 12 and 14 of the Second Book of Kings, and in Chapters 22-25 of 2 Chronicles. There is no way of knowing why these generations have been left out by Matthew from the geneology. It seems simply to be one of his great mistakes.

2. Is the correct name Uzziah or Ozias, as he is named by 2 Kings and I Chronicles?

Error No. 47

Again in the same passage we find this statement:

And Salathiel begat Zorobabel.[1]

This is also incorrect because Zorobabel was the son of Pedaiah[2] and the nephew of Salathiel as is expressly mentioned in I Chronicles 3.

Error No. 48

The same passage of genealogy in Matthew states:

1. Matt. 1:12
2. I Chr. 3:19 says: "And the sons of Pedaiah were Zerubbabel and Shimei."

Zorobabel begat Abiud.[1]

This, too, is wrong since Zerubbabel had only five sons, as is confirmed by I Chronicles. None of the five sons is of this name.[2]

There are in all eleven errors in the genealogy recorded by Matthew. If the differences of Luke and Matthew, discussed earlier are also included they total seventeen mistakes. This short passage of Matthew is, therefore, erroneous in no less than seventeen places.

Error No. 49

Matthew describes the event of some wise men from the east who had seen the star which was the sign of the birth of Christ. They came to Jerusalem, and, guided by the star, they reached Bethlehem where the star halted above the head of the infant.

Astronomically this statement is ridiculous and unacceptable. The movement of stars and some comets as seen from the earth is from the East to the West, and some of the comets move contrarily from the West to the East. Bethlehem is situated to the south of Jerusalem. Besides the men coming from the east could not possibly see the movement of a star which is too slow to be seen by the naked eye. And in any case how could a moving star, if it did ever come to a stop in the sky, be said to have stopped at the head of a new born child.[3]

1. Matt. 1:13.
2. "And the sons of Zerubbabel, Meshullam and Hananiah, and Shelomith, their sister: and Hashubah and Ohel, and Berechiah, and Hasadiah, Jushab-hesed five" 1 Chr. 3:25
3.This objection, in our opinion does not carry much weight, since Jesus was the Prophet who was born miraculously without a biological father. The moving and halting of the star could have happened as a miracle. Besides, the movement of the

Error No. 50

In Chapter One of Matthew we read this statement:

> Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying,
> Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name "Emmanuel".[1]

According to the Christian writers the Prophet referred to in this verse is the Prophet Isaiah, because in his book he had said:

> Therefore, the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name "Emmanuel".[2]

This is again incorrect for the following reasons:

1. The original word that has been translated as 'virgin' by Matthew and the translator of the book of Isaiah is *'alamah'* which is the feminine form of *'alam'* which according to the Jewish scholars, signifies a 'young girl' married or unmarried. This word is also used, as they say, in the Book of Proverbs, Chapter 30, where it is used for a young married woman. The three famous Latin translations say 'young woman'. These translations are the earliest known translations and are said to have been made in 129, 175, and 200. In view of these ancient translations and the opinion of the Jewish scholars, Matthew's statement is shown to be erroneous.

Frier, in his book on the etymology of Hebrew words, a book

comets and stars as explained by the author was accepted up to the 18th century A.D. Modern scientific data, however, has produced more convincing explanations of the directions and paths of the stars.

1. Matt. 1:22,23.
2. Isaiah 7:14.

that is considered the most authentic work on the subject, said that the word *'alamah*, had a dual meaning: 'virgin' and 'young woman'. His opinion, as compared to the commentaries of the Jews, is not acceptable, and even if we accept this opinion, the word cannot be taken to mean a virgin with any argument against the established meaning adopted by the commentators and the ancient translators. The above facts are certainly enough to prove falsity of the statement of the author of *Meezan-ul-Haq*, who claimed that the word had no other meaning than 'virgin'.

2. Jesus was never called by the name Emmanuel, nor did his adopted father[1] give this name to him:

> The angel told his father to call him with the name of Jesus.[2]

It is also a fact that Gabriel came to his mother and said:

> Thou shall conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son and shalt call his name Jesus.[3]

Apart from this Jesus himself never claimed that his name was Emmanuel.

3. The passage where this word occurs, precludes its application to Jesus. It states that Rezin, the king of Syria, and Pekah, the king of Israel, went together to war against Ahaz, the king of Judah. He was very frightened and God sent a revelation to Isaiah as a consolation for Ahaz, saying that he should not be

1. Joseph, the carpenter.
2. Matt. 1:21.
3. Luke 1:31.

frightened as his enemies would not be able to prevail against him, and that their kingdoms would be destroyed, and that the sign of their destruction was that a young woman would bring forth a son and before the child grew up their kingdoms would be destroyed.[1]

In fact Jesus was born after 721 years of the destruction of the kingdoms which were destroyed only 21 years after the above Prophecy. Judaeo-Christian scholars disagree on this point. Some of them have claimed that Isaiah used the word 'young woman' for his own wife who would conceive and give birth to a child. And the two kings, of whom the people were frightened, would be destroyed along with their kingdom before the child grew up. This was said by Dr. Benson and seems to have logic and bear truth.

Error No. 51

There is another statement in Matthew regarding Joseph, the carpenter:

> And was there until the death of Herod, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying out of Egypt have I called my son.[2]

The Prophet referred to in this text is Hosea and Matthew makes reference to the first verse of Chapter 11 of his book, which is absolutely incorrect as that verse has nothing to do with Jesus. The verse, according to the Arabic translation, printed in 1811, reads like this:

> When Israel was a child, then I loved him and called

1. Isaiah 7:1-17.
2. Matt. 2:15.

his sons out of Egypt.

This verse, is in fact, an expression of God's benevolence to the Israelites conferred upon them in the time of Moses. Matthew made two changes in the text. He changed the plural, 'sons', into the singular, 'son', and turned the third person 'his' into the first person making it 'my son'.

Following the example of Matthew, the Arabic translator of 1844 changed the text to incorporate this alteration.

Besides, this change cannot be overlooked because further in this chapter the people who were called from Egypt are mentioned in these words:

> As they called them, so they went from them, they sacrificed unto Baalim.[1]

This statement cannot be applied to Jesus.

Error No. 52

It is also stated in Matthew:

> Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wroth, and sent forth, and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise men.[2]

This statement is wrong both logically and historically. Historically because none of the non-Christian historians mentioned this event of the slaying of the infants by Herod.

1. Hosea 11:2.
2. Matt. 2:16.

For example Josephus did not said anything regarding this event. Similarly the Jewish scholars, who are very hostile and antagonistic towards Herod, and have been very particular in describing any weak points of Herod which they could dig out from history, have not said anything in this regard. Had this incident been true they would have jumped at it and described it as negatively as possible. If any Christian historian were to describe it, he would certainly base his description on the statement in the Gospel of Matthew.

And logically it is not acceptable because Bethlehem, at that time, was a small village situated near Jerusalem. Herod, being the governor could easily have found out the house where the wise men had stayed. It was absolutely unnecessary for him to commit such a heinous act as killing innocent children.[1]

Error No. 53

The Gospel of Matthew also contains this statement:

> Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremiah the Prophet, saying,
> In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted because they are not.[2]

This is again a clearly distorted rendering of the text of Jeremiah. Any reader can himself look up the passage in

1. This refers to the wise men who had seen the star of Jesus' birth. They came to Jerusalem to search for him and told Herod, the governor about the child. Herod asked them to inform him when they found the child. When he came to know that the wise men had left without his knowledge, he sent his men to kill all the children, who were born within two years.
2. Matt. 2:17,18.

Jeremiah,[1] and see for himself that the above verse has nothing to do with Herod. It is clearly related to the famous historical calamity of Nebuchadnezzar's invasion of Jerusalem. The people of Rachel's tribe were among the Israelites who were exiled to Babylon. Her soul lamented over the misery of her people. God, therefore, promised that her children would be released to go back to their own land.

Error No. 54

We find this statement in Matthew:

> And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets. He shall be called a Nazarene.[2]

This is also certainly incorrect, as this statement is not found in any of the books of the Prophets. The Jews deny the validity of this kind of prediction. According to them it is simply a false claim. On the contrary they had a firm belief that no prophet would ever come from Galilee, not to speak of Nazareth, as is expressly stated in the Gospel of John:

> They answered and said unto him, Art thou also of Galilee? Search, and look: For out of Galilee ariseth no Prophet.[3]

The Christian scholars have put forward[4] weak explanations

1. Matt. 2:23.
2. 31:15.
3. John 7:52.
4. The commentator R.A Knox, a writer of modern times, after reproducing the opinions of various commentators has said words to the effect that there is no statement in the Old Testament that the Messiah would be a Nazarene. (The commentary on the New Testament printed in London in 1953. Vol. I, page 4.)

regarding this, which do not deserve any serious consideration.

Readers will have noted that there are seventeen errors in the first two chapters of Matthew.

Error No. 55

According to the Arabic translations printed in 1671, 1821, 1826, 1854 and 1880, there is a statement in Matthew which reads as follows:

> In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judaea.[1]

And in the Persian translations printed in 1671, 1821, 1826, 1854 and 1880, we find the same statement:

> In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judaea.

In this passage the phrase, 'in those days' refers to the days when Archelaus did reign in Judaea, because just before the verse in question, Matthew has described that after the death of Herod, Archelaus became the king of Judaea and Joseph, the carpenter, took the child (Jesus) and his wife to Galilee and settled in the city of Nazareth, and that at this time came John, the Baptist.

This statement is certainly wrong because John, the Baptist delivered his sermon preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins eighteen years after the events discussed above, since it is clear from Luke[2] that John, the Baptist delivered this sermon when Pontius Pilate was the governor of Judaea, and that it was the fifteenth year of Tiberius' reign. The

1. Matt. 3:1.
2. Luke 3:1.

Emperor Tiberius began his reign fourteen years after the birth of Jesus. (*Britannica* page 246 Vol. 2 under Tiberius) This implies that John, the Baptist came twenty-nine years after the birth of Jesus. In the seventh year after the birth of Jesus, Archelaus had left his throne of Judaea. (*Britannica* 246 vol. 2 under Archelaus) If we assume that the beginning of Archelaus reign and the arrival of Joseph in Nazareth were before the birth of Jesus, the coming of John the Baptist will be proved to have been twenty-eight years after the birth of Jesus.

Error No. 56: The Name of Herodias' Husband

We find in Matthew:

> For Herod had laid hold on John and bound him, and put him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife.[1]

This statement is also historically wrong, because the name of Herodias' husband was Herodius, as is stated by Josephus in Chapter 12 of Vol. 8 of his history.

Error No. 57

It is stated in Matthew:

> But he said unto them, Have ye not read what David did, when he was an hungred, and they that were with him;
>
> How he entered into the house of God and did eat the shewbread, which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him.[2]

1. Matt.14:3.
2. Matt. 12:3,4.

The phrase "neither for them which were with him" is clearly wrong as will be discussed under Error No. 92.

Error No. 58

Matthew contains this statement:

> Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value.[1]

This statement is also wrong as will be shown later in the book.

Error No. 59: The Earthquake on Jesus' Crucifixion

Once more we find in Matthew:

> And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent;
> And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose.
> And came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city and appeared unto many.[2]

This is a concocted story. Norton, the famous scholar, though he favoured the gospels, said, proving the falsity of this story with several arguments, "This is a totally false story. It seems that such stories were prevalent among the Jews at the time of destruction of Jerusalem. Possibly someone might have written this story as a marginal note in the Gospel of Matthew,

1. Matt. 27:9
2. Matt. 27:51-53

and later on it might have been included in the text, the translator might have translated it from that text.[1]

The falsehood of this story is evident for several reasons:

1. The Jews went to Pilate, the day after the Crucifixion of Christ, and said to Pilate:

> Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive. After three days I will rise again.
>
> Command therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day.[2]

Moreover, Matthew, in the same chapter expressly states that Pilate and his wife were not pleased at the crucifixion of Christ. The Jews would not dare go to Pilate in these circumstances, especially when there was an earthquake and the graves opened and the rocks rent. The fact that Pilate was not pleased at the crucifixion of Christ, would have put him into a rage against the Jews. They could have not gone to Pilate to say that Christ was a 'deceiver', God forbid.

2. In the presence of such miraculous signs a great number of people of that time would have embraced the new faith without hesitation, whereas, according to the Bible, three thousand people did accept the new faith, but only when the Holy Spirit descended on the disciples and they spoke several languages before the people. This event is explicitly mentioned in Acts.[3]

The events described by Matthew were obviously of a much more compelling nature than the disciples speaking in several

1. R.A Knox, in his commentary on the New Testament has made similar admission and said that Matthew has trusted more in local rumours and myths than the other Evangelists, p.70 vol. I
2. Matt. 27:63-64
3. Acts: 2:1-40.

languages.

3. Is it not surprising that none of the historians of that time and of the time succeeding it, and none of the evangelists except Matthew, has written a single word about these events of so great an historical importance?

It is of no avail to say that opponents have deliberately avoided any reference to these events. But what do they have to say of the absence of any account of these events in the books of those Christian historians who are considered to be advocates of Christianity. In particular the absence of any description of these events in the Gospel of Luke is very surprising, as he is generally known for reporting the rarities of the life of Jesus, as is clear from the first chapters of his gospel and of the Book of Acts.

We cannot understand why all the evangelists, or at least most of them, have not referred to these events when they have given full account of events of no or lesser, significance. Mark and Luke, too, only speak of the splitting of the veil and not of anything else.

4. Since the veil in question was made of silk, we cannot understand how a soft curtain of silk could be torn like this, and if it was true, how the building of the temple could remain unaffected. This objection is forwarded equally to all evangelists.

5. The bodies of the saints coming out of the graves happens to be in clear contradiction to the statement of Paul, in which he said that Christ was the first to rise from the dead.

The learned scholar Norton truthfully said that this evangelist seems to be in the habit of making his own guesses, and is not always able to sort out the truth from the available stock of

events. Can such a man be trusted with the word of God?[1]

Errors No. 60,61,62: The Resurrection of Jesus

The Gospel of Matthew reports Jesus' answering to some scribes:

> But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the Prophet Jonas:
>
> For Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.[2]

We find a similar statement in the same gospel:

> A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given unto it, but the sign of the Prophet Jonas.[3]

The same is understood from the statement of the Jews reported by Matthew:

> Sir, we remember that, that deceiver said while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again.[4]

1. Maurice Bucaille, a recent French scholar, in his book, *The Bible, The Qur'an and Science* has said on page 61, making comments on this statement by Matthew: "Matthew takes very serious liberties with the text ... this is another example of his imagination. It is difficult to see how the bodies of the saints could have risen from the dead at the time of Jesus's death (according to the gospel it was on the eve of the Sabbath) and emerged from their tombs after his resurrection."
2. Matt. 12:39-40.
3. Matt. 16:4.
4. Matt. 27:63.

All these statements are incorrect for the fact is that according to the gospels Jesus was crucified on Friday in the afternoon and died at about nine in the evening. Joseph asked Pilate for his body in the evening and arranged his funeral, as is clear from the Gospel of Mark. He was therefore buried in the night of Friday, and his body is said to have disappeared on the morning of Sunday, as described by John. According to this detail, his body did not remain in the earth for more than one day and two nights. Therefore his statement of staying in the earth for three days and three nights is proved incorrect.

Seeing the error in these statements, Paley and Channer admitted that the statement in question was not of Jesus but was the result of Matthew's own imagination. Both of them said words to the effect that Jesus would have meant to convince them only through his preachings without their asking a sign from him, like the people of Nineveh, who embraced the new faith without a sign from Jonah.

According to these two scholars this statement was proof of a lack of understanding on the part of Matthew. It also proves that Matthew did not write his gospel by inspiration. His not understanding the intention of Jesus in this case, shows that he could well have written similarly erroneous accounts in other places.

It is, therefore, a natural conclusion that the gospel of Matthew cannot, in any way be called revelation but is rather a collection of accounts influenced by the local environment and the result of human imagination.

Error No. 63: The Second Coming of Jesus

It is stated in Matthew:

> For the son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every

> man according to his works.
>
> Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the son of man coming in his kingdom.[1]

This statement has definitely been wrongly attributed to Jesus, because all those 'standing here', died nearly two thousand years ago, and none of them saw the Son of Man coming into his kingdom.

Error No. 64: Another Prediction of Jesus

Matthew reports Jesus saying to his disciples:

> But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another, for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the son of man be come.[2]

Again this is obviously wrong as the disciples have, long, long ago, done their duty of going over the cities of Israel, but the Son of Man never came with his kingdom.

Errors No. 65 - 68

The book of Revelations contains this statement:

> Behold, I come quickly:[3]

The same words are found in chapter 22 verse 7 of the same book. And verse 10 of the same chapter contains this statement:

> Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand."

1. Matt.16:27,28
2. Matt.10:23.
3. Rev. 3:11.

Further in verse 20 it says again:

> Surely, I come quickly.

On the basis of these statements of Christ, the earlier followers of Christianity held the firm belief that the second coming of Christ would be in their own time. They believed that they were living in the last age and that the day of Judgement was very near at hand. The Christian scholars have confirmed that they held this belief.

Errors No. 69 - 75

The Epistle of James contains this statement:

> Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth near.[1]

It also appears in I Peter:

> But the end of all things is at hand: be ye therefore sober and watch unto prayer.[2]

And the First Epistle of Peter contains these words:

> Little children, it is the last time.[3]

And the First Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians states:

> For this we say unto you, by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of

1. James 5:8.
2. I Peter 4:7.
3. I Peter 4:7.

the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep.

For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first:

Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.[1]

And Paul said in his letter to Philippians:

The Lord is at hand.[2]

And in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul said:

And they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the worlds are come.[3]

Paul also said later in the same letter:

Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed,

In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.[4]

The above seven statements are the arguments for our claim that the early Christians held a firm belief in the second coming of Christ during their own lifetime, with the result that all the seven statements are proved false.

Errors No. 76 - 78: The Signs of the End of the World

Matthew describes in Chapter 24 that the disciples of Jesus

1. 1 Thess. 4:15-17.
2. Phil. 4:5.
3. 1 Cor. 10:11.
4. 1 Cor. 15:51,52.

asked the Messiah, when they were on the Mount of Olives, about the signs of the destruction of the Temple and the second coming of Jesus and about the end of the world. Jesus told them all the signs, first of the destruction of the House of the Lord, of his own coming to the earth again and of the day of Judgement. The description up to verse 28 talks of the destruction of the Temple; and verse 29 to the end of the chapter consists of the events related to the second coming of Christ and the Day of Judgement. Some verses of this chapter according to the Arabic translation[1] printed in 1820, read thus :

> Immediately after the tribulation of those days, shall the sun be darkened, and the moon will not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken.
>
> And then shall appear the sign of the son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.
>
> And he shall send his angels with a great sound of trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of the heaven to the other.[2]

And in verses 34 and 35 it says:

> Verily I say unto you. This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.
>
> Heaven and earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away.

The text of the Arabic translation printed in 1844 is exactly the same. However, the Persian translations of 1816, 1828, 1842

1.The English translation accords exactly in with the Arabic translation referred to above, we have, therefore, reproduced it from the King James version.(Translator)
2. Matt. 24:29-31.

contain:

> Immediately after the trouble of those days, the sun shall be darkened.

Verse 34 of these translations is identical to the one quoted above. It is, therefore necessary that the day of Judgement should come at the time when the House of God has been destroyed and Jesus has reappeared on the earth, "...immediately after the trouble of those days," according to the statement of Jesus. Similarly it is also necessary that the generation contemporary with Christ should not have died until they saw these event with their eyes, as was the belief of the early Christians. However they did die centuries ago and heaven and earth still continue to exist.

The evangelists, Mark and Luke also included similar descriptions in Chapters 13 and 21 respectively of their gospels. The three evangelists are equally responsible for this historically proved-false statement.

Errors No. 79 - 80: The Reconstruction of the Temple

The Gospel of Matthew reports this statement of Christ:

> Verily I say unto you. There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.[1]

The Protestant scholars have therefore said that any construction to be built on the foundations of the temple would be razed to the ground as had been foretold by Jesus. The Author of *Tehqeeq-e-Deen-ul-Haq*, (Inquisition into the True Faith) printed in 1846, said on page 394:

1. Matt. 24:2.

King Julian, who lived three hundred years after Christ and had become an apostate, intended to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, so that he could thus refute the prediction of Jesus. When he started the construction suddenly a fire jumped out from its foundations. All the workers were frightened and fled away from there. No-one after him ever dared to refute the saying of the truthful, who had said, "The heaven and the earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away."

The priest Dr. Keith wrote a book in renunciation of the disbelievers in Christ which was translated into Persian by Rev. Mirak entitled *"Kashf-ul-Asar-Fi-Qisas-e-Bani Israel"* (An exposition of the Israelite Prophets) and printed in Edinburgh in 1846. We produce the translation of a passage from page 70:

King Julian allowed the Jews to rebuild Jerusalem and the temple. He also promised that they would be allowed to live in the city of their ancestors, the Jews were no less grieved than the king was pleased. They started the work of the Temple. Since it was against the prophecy of Christ, the Jews, in spite of their best efforts and all the possible help from the king could not succeed in their mission. Some pagan historians have reported that the huge flames of fire burst out of this place and burnt the workers stopping the work altogether.

Thomas Newton, in vol 3 (pages 63 and 64) of his commentary on the prophecies of the Holy Scripture printed in London in 1803 said, which we translate here from Urdu:

Omar, the second great Caliph of Islam, spread corruption all over the world. He reigned for ten and a half years. In this short period he made great conquests and conquered all the countries of Arabia, Syria, Iran and Egypt. The Caliph personally besieged Jerusalem and in 637 A.D. signed the treaty of peace with the Christians

who were tired of the prolonged siege. The Christians surrendered and handed over the city to Omar.

> Omar offered generous terms to the Christians. He did not take any church into his possession, but he requested the high priest for a piece of land to build a mosque. The priest showed him the room of Jacob and Solomon's temple. The Christians had covered this place with dirt and filth out of their hatred for the Jews. Omar, himself, cleansed the place with his own hands. Following the example of Omar, the great officers of his army thought it their religious duty and cleansed the place with religious zeal and built a mosque there. This was the first mosque ever built in Jerusalem. Some historians have also added that in the same mosque Omar was murdered by a slave. Abdul Malik, son of Marvan, who was the twelfth Caliph extended this mosque in his reign.

Though, the above description of this commentator is not true in several places, he has admitted that the first mosque built at the place of Solomon's Temple was that built by the Caliph Omar, and that it was extended by Abdul Malik and still exists in Jerusalem after over 1200 years.[1] How would it have been possible for Omar to succeed in building a mosque there if it had really been against the prophecy of Christ?

Since this statement of Jesus is also reported by Mark and Luke, they are equally responsible for this false description.

Error No. 82: A False Prediction

Matthew reports this statement as having been said by Jesus to his disciples :

> And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you,

1. More than 1400 years have now passed since this event.

> That ye which have followed me, in regeneration when the son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye shall also sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.[1]

It is quite apparent from this that Jesus assured his twelve disciples, of eternal success and redemption promising them to sit upon twelve thrones on the Day of Judgement. This prophetic witness of eternal success has been proved wrong by the gospels themselves. We have already seen[2] that one of the disciples of Jesus, namely Judas Iscariot, betrayed Jesus and became an apostate, how, then is it possible for him to sit on the twelfth throne on the Day of Judgement?

Error No. 83

We find in the Gospel of John:

> And he (Jesus) saith unto him, Verily, verily I say unto you. Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the son of man.[3]

This is also historically false and incorrect, for, this was said by Jesus after his baptism and after the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him,[4] while we know that nothing like this ever happened in history after this. These prophetic words have never come true.

1. Matt. 19:28.
2. See Matt. 26:4, 26:47, 27:3.
3. John 1:51.
4. We have already discussed the details of this event earlier in the book, however they can be seen in John 1:32.

Error No. 84: The Ascension of Christ

It is said in John:

> And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the son of man which is in heaven.[1]

This is also incorrect, as is evident from the fifth chapter of Genesis[2] and 2 Kings Chapter 2.[3]

Error No. 85

We find this statement in the gospel of Mark:

> For verily I say unto you, That whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that those things which he saith shall come to pass; he shall have whatsoever saith.[4]

We find another similar statement in the same book:

> And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues;
>
> They shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.[5]

1. John 3:13.
2. "And Enoch walked with God, and he was not; for God took him." Gen. 5:24.
3. "Behold! there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven." 2 Kings 2:11.
4. Mark 11:23
5. Mark 16:17-18

And in the gospel of John we read the following statement:

> Verily, verily I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do, shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father.[1]

The prophetic promise made in the above texts is a general statement that does not particularise any man or people, particularly the phrase, "Whosoever shall say unto this mountain" which is totally unconditional and can be applied to any people of any time. Similarly the statement, "He that believeth on me," can include any believer in Christ of any time. There is no argument to support the claim that the above predictions were particularly made in respect of the early Christians. It is therefore, necessary for a mountain to move and be cast into the sea, if a believer says so to it, of course, with firm belief in Christ. Everyone knows that nothing like this has even happened in history. We would like very much to know if any Christian, in or after the time of Jesus, did perform "works greater than Christ" as the evangelist has made Jesus say this in the above prediction.

The Protestants have more than admitted that after the time of Jesus the occurrence of miracles and marvels has never been proved in history. We have seen many priests in India, who, in spite of making strenuous efforts for many years are not able to speak correctly in Urdu, let alone take up serpents, drink poison and heal the sick.

3. John 14:12.

THE FALLIBITY OF LUTHER AND CALVIN

Perhaps we might be allowed at this juncture, for the interest of the readers, to reproduce two incidents directly related to Luther and Calvin, the founders of the Protestant faith. We quote this from the book entitled *Mira'atus Sidq* that was translated into Urdu by a Catholic scholar and priest Thomas Inglus and printed in 1857. He relates the following incidents on pages 105-107:

> In 1543 Luther tried to cast out the devil from the son of Messina with a result similar to the Jews who once tried to cast out devil as is described by the Book of Acts in Chapter 19. Satan, in the same way attacked Luther and wounded him and his companions. Stiffels seeing that his spiritual leader, Luther was being choked and strangled by Satan, tried to run away but being in great terror was not able to open the latch of the door and had to break down the door with a hammer which was thrown to him from the outside by his servant through a ventilator.
>
> Another incident is related of Calvin, the great leader of the Protestants, by another historian. Calvin once hired a man called Bromius and told him to lie down in front of the people and pretend to be dead. He arranged with him that when he heard Calvin say the words, "Bromius, rise from the dead and be alive," he should rise from the bed as though he had been dead and had just risen, having been miraculously brought to life. The wife of Bromius was also told to cry and lament over the body of her husband.
>
> Bromius and his wife acted accordingly and people, hearing her cries and lamentation, gathered there for her consolation. Calvin came and said to the weeping woman, "Do not cry. I will raise him from the dead."
>
> He began to recite some prayers and then holding the hand of Bromius, said, "Rise in the name of God." but

> his design of deceiving people in the name of God was not a success as Bromius really had died. God had avenged Calvin for his deception and iniquity. Bromius' wife, seeing that her husband had died in reality started crying and blaming Calvin.

Both these leaders were considered to be the greatest spiritual leaders of their time. If they can be blamed for such acts what remains to be said of the generality of the people.

Pope Alexander VI, the head of the Roman church and the representative of the Lord on the earth, according to the Catholic faith, had prepared some poison for some other persons, but drinking it himself by mistake he died. One cannot avoid coming to the conclusion that the leaders of both the rival sects do not possess any of the qualities mentioned in the prediction under discussion.

Error No. 86

The gospel of Luke states:

> Which was the son of Joanna, which was the son of Rhesa, which was the son of Zorobabel, which was the son of Salathiel, which was the son of Neri.[1]

This genealogical description of the Christ contains three errors:

1. The sons of Zorobabel or Zerubbabel are described very clearly in 1 Chronicles Chapter 3 and none of them has this name. We have already discussed this earlier and besides this, it is against the description of Matthew.

1. Luke 3:27

2. Zerubbabel is the son of Pedaiah, not Salathiel. He is, however, his nephew.

3. Salathiel is the son of Jeconias, not of Neri. Matthew has also agrees with this.

Error No. 87

In his account of the genealogy of Jesus, Luke states:

> ...which was the son of Sala,
> Which was the son Cainan which was the son of Arphaxad...[1]

This statement is also not correct as Sala was the son of Arphaxad, and not his grandson, which is clear from the book of Genesis[2] and from I Chronicles.[3]

The Hebrew version has always preference over any translation according to the Protestants.[4] No translation can be preferred to the original Hebrew version simply because it corresponds with the description of Luke. On the contrary, such a translation would be considered unacceptable on the grounds that it has been modified.

Error No. 88

We read the following statement in Luke:

> And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world

1. Luke 3:35,36.
2. "And Arphaxad lived five and thirty years, and begat Salah." Gen. 11:12.
3. "Shem, Arphaxad, Shelah." 1 Chr. I:24.
4. The author might have said this because in some translations the texts of Genesis and Chronicles might have been changed to correspond with Luke.

should be taxed,

(And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria).[1]

This, too, is incorrect because the phrase "all the world" includes the total population of the Roman empire. No historian prior to, or contemporary with Luke ever mentioned this tax before the birth of Jesus in his history.

Later historians, when describing it, only do so using Luke as their source which is unacceptable. Apart from this, it seems impossible that Cyrenius, who was governor of Syria fifteen years after the birth of Jesus, could have done the taxing which was accomplished fifteen years prior to the birth of Jesus. Equally unbelievable is the notion that Jesus was born during the time of his governorship, because in this case we are required to believe that Mary remained in the state of pregnancy for as long as fifteen years. It is so because Luke has admitted in the second chapter that the wife of Zacharias conceived in the reign of Herod[2] and that Mary conceived Jesus six month later.

Realizing this "difficulty" some Christian scholars have declared that verse 2 is a later addition and not written by Luke.

Error No. 89

Luke states:

> Now in the fifteenth year of the Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip, tetrarch of Ituraea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene.[3]

1. Luke 2:1.
2. Herod happens to be fifteen years prior to Cyrenius.
3. Luke 3:1 In some translations the name Abileah has appeared, instead of Abilene.

This is incorrect as the historians have denied of there being any ruler of Abilene named Lysaneas in the time of Herod and Pontius Pilate.

Error No. 90

In the same chapter of Luke we find this statement:

> But Herod the tetrarch, being reproved by him for Herodias, his brother Philip's wife, and for all the evils which Herod had done.[1]

This is absolutely wrong, as we have shown under Error No. 56 and as will be discussed later in the book. The mistake was made by Luke and not by the copier, as has been said by some exegetes admitting the presence of the mistake in the text.

Error No. 91

We find in Mark:

> For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife...[2]

This statement too, is erroneous, as we have already discussed. All the three evangelists are equally responsible for this error. The translator of the Arabic versions printed 1821 and 1844 has manipulated the texts of Matthew and Luke and deleted the word Philip, while other translators have not followed his example.

1. Luke 3:19.
2. Mark 6:17.

Errors No. 92-94: Did David Eat Shewbread?

It appears in Mark:

> Have ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was an hungred, he, and they that were with him?
>
> How he went into the house of God, in the days of Abiathar, the high priest, and did eat the shewbread, which is not lawful to eat but for the priests, and gave also to them which were with him?[1]

Earlier in the book we showed that this statement is also incorrect, since David at that time was alone,[2] therefore the phrase "they that were with him" is a mis-statement. Besides, it is incorrect to say the high priest at that time was Abiathar, whereas, in fact, Ahimelech was the high priest. The falsity of this statement can also be understood from the beginning of 1 Samuel 21 and 22.

There are three errors in two verses of Mark. The third error will also be discussed later. The Christian scholars have plainly admitted that Mark has made a mistake in this text.

Errors No. 95 - 96

The Gospel of Luke also describes the same event with words signifying that David was accompanied at that time, when, as we have just shown, he was alone.

Error No. 97

The First Epistle to Corinthians contains the following sen-

1. Mark 2:25,26.
2. "Ahimelech was afraid at the meeting of David, and said unto him, Why art thou alone, and no man with thee?"

This is incorrect as the historians have denied of there being any ruler of Abilene named Lysaneas in the time of Herod and Pontius Pilate.

Error No. 90

In the same chapter of Luke we find this statement:

> But Herod the tetrarch, being reproved by him for Herodias, his brother Philip's wife, and for all the evils which Herod had done.[1]

This is absolutely wrong, as we have shown under Error No. 56 and as will be discussed later in the book. The mistake was made by Luke and not by the copier, as has been said by some exegetes admitting the presence of the mistake in the text.

Error No. 91

We find in Mark:

> For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife...[2]

This statement too, is erroneous, as we have already discussed. All the three evangelists are equally responsible for this error. The translator of the Arabic versions printed 1821 and 1844 has manipulated the texts of Matthew and Luke and deleted the word Philip, while other translators have not followed his example.

1. Luke 3:19.
2. Mark 6:17.

Errors No. 92-94: Did David Eat Shewbread?

It appears in Mark:

> Have ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was an hungred, he, and they that were with him?
>
> How he went into the house of God, in the days of Abiathar, the high priest, and did eat the shewbread, which is not lawful to eat but for the priests, and gave also to them which were with him?[1]

Earlier in the book we showed that this statement is also incorrect, since David at that time was alone,[2] therefore the phrase "they that were with him" is a mis-statement. Besides, it is incorrect to say the high priest at that time was Abiathar, whereas, in fact, Ahimelech was the high priest. The falsity of this statement can also be understood from the beginning of 1 Samuel 21 and 22.

There are three errors in two verses of Mark. The third error will also be discussed later. The Christian scholars have plainly admitted that Mark has made a mistake in this text.

Errors No. 95 - 96

The Gospel of Luke also describes the same event with words signifying that David was accompanied at that time, when, as we have just shown, he was alone.

Error No. 97

The First Epistle to Corinthians contains the following sen-

1. Mark 2:25,26.
2. "Ahimelech was afraid at the meeting of David, and said unto him, Why art thou alone, and no man with thee?"

tence:

And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve.[1]

This statement is quite obviously wrong, since one of the twelve, Judas Iscariot had died prior to this event, reducing the number of the disciples to eleven. Mark, therefore, says in Chapter 16:

He appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat.[2]

Errors No. 98-100

Matthew says:

But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak.
For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.[3]

Luke also reports this in the following words:

And when they bring you unto the synagogues, and unto magistrates, and powers, take ye no thought, how or what thing shall ye answer, or what ye shall say:
For the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say.[4]

A similar statement is also given in Mark in chapter 13. The implication of the texts contained in the three gospels is that Jesus promised his disciples that whatever they said to the offi-

1. 1 Cor. 15:5. It refers to the event of resurrection of Jesus.
2. Mark 16:14.
3. Matt. 10:19,20.
4. Luke 12:11,12.

cers would be inspired to them by the Holy Ghost, which in turn signified that their words would not be their own words but the word of the Holy Ghost.

This statement is shown to be incorrect in the light of the following passage of the Book of Acts:

> And Paul, earnestly beholding the council, said, Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day.
> And the high priest Ananias commanded them that stood by him to smite him on the mouth.
> Then said Paul unto him, God shall smite thee, thou whited wall: For sittest thou to judge me after the law and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?
> And they that stood by said, Revilest thou God's high priest?
> Then said Paul, I wist not, brethern, that he was the high priest: for it is written, Thou shall not speak evil of the ruler of thy people.[1]

Had the statement of Matthew and Luke been true, their spiritual leader Paul, who is considered equal in status with the disciples and who himself claims to be equal to Peter, the greatest of all disciples,[2] could have not said anything erroneous before the council.[1] Paul's admission to his fault is enough to prove the text incorrect. We shall later on show that the Christian scholars have admitted the presence of error in this text. Since this text has appeared in the three gospels, this makes three errors in the text.

1. Acts 23:1- 5.
2. For nothing am I behind the chiefest apostles, though I be nothing 12:11.
3.That is to say, Paul should have been informed by the Holy Ghost of his being the high Priest as was promised by the Gospels.

Errors No. 101 &102

In Luke we find:

> ...in the days of Elias, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months...[1]

and in the Epistle of James:

> ...and it rained not on earth by the space of three years and six months.[2]

This also seems incorrect as it is understood from I Kings that there was rain in the third year.[3]

Since this statement has appears in Luke as being said by Jesus, while in the Epistle of James, as the statement of James himself, this, in fact, makes it two mistakes.

Error No. 103: Jesus and the Throne of David

The Gospel of Luke says in chapter 1:

> And Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David:
> And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his Kingdom there shall be no end.[4]

This is incorrect for the following two reasons:

1. Because Jesus, according to the genealogy given by Matthew, is a descendant of Jehoiakim, and none of his descen-

1. Luke 4:25.
2. James 5:17.
3. "The word of the Lord came to Elijah in the third year, saying, 'Show thyself unto Ahab and I will send rain upon the earth.' " 1 Kings 18:1.
4. Luke 1:32,33.

dants can sit on the throne of David according to the statement of the Prophet Jeremiah.[1]

2. Secondly because historically we know that Jesus never sat on the throne of David even for a single minute; nor did he ever rule over the house of Jacob. On the contrary, the Jews became hostile to him to the extent that they arrested him and took him to Pilate, who reviled him and then handed him over to the Jews to crucify.

Besides, it is clear from the Gospel of John that Jesus hated the idea of being a king,[2] and, moreover, it is unbelievable that Jesus would hate something for which he was sent by God.

Error No. 104

We find the following passage in Mark:

> Jesus answered, and said, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands for my sake, and the gospel's,
>
> But he shall receive hundred-fold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life.[3]

And Luke reports these words in the same context:

> ...who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come, life everlasting.[4]

1. "Therefore thus saith the Lord of Jehoiakim, King of Judah: He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David." Jer. 36:30
2. "When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himself alone." John 6:15
3. Mark 10:29,30.
4. Luke 18:30.

This cannot be true because, according to their law the Christians are not allowed to marry more than one woman. It would therefore, not be possible for a man leaving his wife for the sake of Jesus, to receive "hundred-fold or at least manifold wives in this present life."

Besides the phrase, "lands with persecutions", is out of place here as Jesus is speaking of the reward that would be given to them by God, hence the phrase "with persecutions" is not relevant, and does not fit the context.

Error No. 105: Jesus Healing the One Possessed by Devils

The Gospel of Mark describes the event of a man possessed by evil spirits and being healed by Jesus, saying:

> And all the devils besought him saying, Send us into the swine that we may enter into them.
>
> And forthwith Jesus gave them leave. And the unclean spirits went out, and entered into the swine; and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea.[1]

This is incorrect, for the reason that the Jews were not allowed to keep swine, being inadmissible for them under the law.

Error No. 106

Matthew reports Jesus saying to the Jews:

> I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.[2]

1. Mark 5:12,13.
2. Matt. 26:64.

It is wrong because the Jews have never seen Christ coming in the clouds of heaven before or after his death.

Error No. 107

Luke has reported in chapter 6:

> The disciple is not above his master, but every man that is perfect shall be as his master.[1]

This appears to be wrong as there are many personalities who have had greater perfection than their teacher.

Error No. 108: Parents: Honour or Hate Them?

The following statement of Jesus has been reported by Luke:

> If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.[2]

It is, all the more, incredible to think that such a remark could have been made by Jesus, when he had said, reproaching the Jews:

> For God commanded, saying, Honour thy father and mother, and, He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death.[3]

We cannot see how Jesus could have said this.

1. Luke 6:40.
2. Luke 14:26.
3. Matt. 15:4.

Error No.109

The Gospel of John says:

> And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year said unto them, Ye know nothing at all.
>
> Nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.
>
> And this spake he not of himself, but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation;
>
> And not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad.[1]

This statement cannot be accepted as true for the following inconsistencies in the text.

Firstly, because this statement implies that the high priest should necessarily be a prophet which is certainly not correct.

Secondly, if the statement of the high priest is accepted as prophetic, it necessitates that the death of Jesus should be an atonement only for the Jews[2] and not for the whole world, which is obviously against the established beliefs and claims of the Christians. And the phrase, "not only for this nation" becomes an absurd statement and against the prophethood of Jesus.

Thirdly, according to the evangelist, this high priest who enjoys the status of a prophet happens to be the same man who was the high priest at the time of the 'crucifixion' of Jesus and the one who passed the religious decree against Jesus accusing

1. John 11:49-52.
2. Perhaps because only the Jews were called the Children of God.

him of being a liar, a disbeliever and being liable to be killed. And he was the one who was pleased at the smiting and insulting of Jesus. This is witnessed to by Matthew who says:

> And they that had laid hold on Jesus led him away to Caiaphas the high priest, where the scribes and the elders were assembled.[1]

And further in the same chapter we find the following details :

> But Jesus held his peace. And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the son of God.
>
> Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said : nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.
>
> Then the high priest rent his clothes saying, He has spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? Behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy.
>
> What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty of death.
>
> Then did they spit in his face, and buffeted him; and others smote him with the palms of their hands,
>
> Saying, Prophesy unto us, thou Christ, Who is he that smote thee?

The fourth gospel, John, is even more explicit, saying:

> And led him away to Annas first: for he was father in law of Caiaphas, which was the high priest that same year.
>
> Now Caiaphas was he, which gave counsel to the

1. Matt. 26:57.
2. Matt 26:63-68.

Jews, that it was expedient that one should die for the people.[1]

We may now be allowed to say that if this statement of the high priest was made by him as a prophet why did he gave his judgement to kill Jesus? He declared him blasphemous and was happy at the humiliation of Jesus in his court. Is it in any way credible that a prophet should command people to kill his God?

We declare our utter disbelief in such prophet who remains a prophet even after committing such profane and sacrilegious acts. From this situation it logically deduced that Jesus was a prophet of God but having gone astray (may God forbid) he claimed of being God incarnate and put a false blame on God. In short, the innocence of Christ, in this case, becomes doubtful. In fact, the evangelist John is also innocent, as is Jesus Christ, of making such incredible statements. The responsibility for all such statements lies totally on the shoulders of the Trinitarians.

If, for a moment, we suppose that Caiaphas's statement is true, even then the significance of his statement would be that when the disciples and the followers of Jesus confirmed that Jesus was, in fact, the Promised Messiah or Christ, since it was generally believed by the people that it was necessary for the Messiah to be a great king of the Jews, Caiaphas and his elders, were afraid that having come to know this fact, the Caesar of Rome would be angry and might make trouble for them, he proposed, "one should die for the people"

This was the real and natural significance of that statement and not that the people of the world would be redeemed and saved from their 'original sin', as they call it, which was committed by Adam thousands of years prior to the birth of the Christ, which is a whimsical and, of course, illogical interpreta-

1. John 18:13,14.

tion of the statement. The Jews also do not believe in this whimsical conception of the Trinitarians.

Perhaps this evangelist, later on, realised the mistake and he replaced the phrase 'he prophesied' with the words 'he gave counsel', in Chapter 18, because to give counsel is very different from making a prophesy as a prophet. Though by making this change he has opened himself to the charge of contradicting his own statement.

Error No. 110

Paul's letter to Hebrews contains this statement:

> For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people,
>
> Saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you.
>
> Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry.[1]

The above statement is incorrect for the following three reasons:

Firstly because the blood was not of calves and goats, but was only of oxen, at that occasion.

Secondly because, the water, the scarlet wool and hyssop were not present; at that moment only the blood was sprinkled.

Thirdly, because Moses himself did not sprinkle on the book and on the vessels as described by Paul, rather half the blood was sprinkled on the altar and half of it on the people.

These three mistakes are clear from the following description

1. Heb. 9:19-21.

given by the book of Exodus. It reads:

> And Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgements : and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the Lord hath said will we do.
>
> And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of the Israel...
>
> ...which offered burnt offerings and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen unto the Lord.
>
> And Moses took half of the blood and put it in basons; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar.
>
> And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient.
>
> And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.[1]

In view of the textual defects and inconsistencies present in the Bible, pointed out to the readers so far, the Roman Catholic Church prohibited the study and reading of these books for common people. They rightly said that the damage caused by the reading of them would be greater than the benefit to be expected from them. They were certainly right in having this opinion. In fact, the contradictions, errors and inconsistencies of the biblical texts were not known to the people until the appearance of the Protestant movement. They discovered and dug into these books and the secrets were disclosed, causing the strong reaction which is well known to the world today.

The book entitled, *Kitabu'th-Thalathu-Ashrah* (The Thirteen

1. Ex. 24:3-8.

Books) printed in Beirut in 1849, contains the following on pages 417, 418 of the Thirteenth Book. We give its faithful translation from Urdu:

> Let us now look at the law passed by the Council of Trent and duly stamped by the Pope. It said that the experience of the past showed that such words when read by common people would produce greater evil than good. It was therefore the responsibility of the priest or of the judge that, according to his description, or in consultation with the teacher of confession, he should allow the reading of the words in these books only to those who, in their opinion, might be benefited by them, and it was of great importance that the book must have been previously checked by a Catholic teacher, and it had to bear the signature of the teacher who allowed it to be read. Anyone who dared read it without permission, was not to be excused unless he was sent to the proper authorities.